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INTRODUCTION

TO THE FIRST EDITION

The following Essays have been written at different intervals during our fifteen years' residence in East London. They were written out of the fulness of the moment with a view of giving a voice to some need of which we had become conscious. They do not, therefore, pretend to set forth any system for dealing with the social problem; they are simply the voice of the dumb poor, of whose mind it has been our privilege to get some understanding. They are published now in response to the requests of many to whom they have been some guide in the ways of service, and in the hope that the experience they offer may bring rich and poor together. It will be noticed that two or three great principles underlie all the reforms for which we ask. The equal capacity of all to enjoy the best, the superiority of quiet ways over those of striving and crying, character as the one thing needful, are the truths with which we have become familiar, and on these truths we take our stand. Although the Essays do not pretend to form a connected whole, it will be seen that their arrangement is subject to some order. Those placed first set forth the poverty of the poor. Those which follow suggest some means by which such poverty may be met (1) by individual and (2) by united action,
with some of the dangers to which charitable effort seems to be liable. As we look back over the experience which these Essays recall, we are conscious of shortcomings and failure, but they are due to our own want of wisdom and of faith, and we still believe that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven, and that the doing of His will means at last health and wealth. Each Essay is signed by the writer, but in either case they represent our common thought, as all that has been done represents our common work.

Samuel A. Barnett and Henrietta O. Barnett.

St. Jude's, Whitechapel: May 1883.
CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO SECOND EDITION—TWENTY YEARS' RETROSPECT. BY REV. S. A. BARNETT . . . . . 1

THE POVERTY OF THE POOR. BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT . . 12

THE POOR OF THE WORLD: INDIA, JAPAN, AND THE UNITED STATES. BY REV. S. A. BARNETT . . . . 30

THE CHILDREN OF THE GREAT CITY. BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT 52

RELIEF FUNDS AND THE POOR. BY REV. S. A. BARNETT . . 58

A CHARITY CLEARING HOUSE. BY REV. S. A. BARNETT . . 79

PASSIONLESS REFORMERS. BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT . . . 88

TOWN COUNCILS AND SOCIAL REFORM. BY REV. S. A. BARNETT 99

HOW TO DEVELOP INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER IN THE CHILDREN COLLECTED TOGETHER IN LARGE PAUPER SCHOOLS. BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT . . . . . . 110

'VOX CLAMANTIS' BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT . . . . . . 123

THE YOUNG WOMEN IN OUR WORKHOUSES. BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT . . . . . . . . . 136

AT HOME' TO THE POOR. BY MRS. S. A. BARNETT . . . . 149
| CONTENTS |
|------------------|------------------|
| UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENTS. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 165 |
| PICTURES FOR THE PEOPLE. By Mrs. S. A. Barnett | 175 |
| A PEOPLE'S CHURCH. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 188 |
| THE CHURCH AND LABOUR DISPUTE. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 200 |
| WHAT HAS THE CHARITY ORGANISATION SOCIETY TO DO WITH SOCIAL REFORM? By Mrs. S. A. Barnett | 207 |
| WHAT GIRLS CAN DO TO HUSH 'THE BITTER CRY.' By Mrs. S. A. Barnett | 220 |
| SENSATIONALISM IN SOCIAL REFORM. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 226 |
| PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 241 |
| THE WORK OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 251 |
| POOR LAW REFORM. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 258 |
| THE POOR LAW AS A CHARITABLE AGENCY. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 276 |
| HUMAN SERVICE. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 285 |
| WHITECHAPEL. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 294 |
| TRAINING FOR THE UNEMPLOYED. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 308 |
| THE WORK OF INDIGNATION. By Rev. S. A. Barnett | 323 |
INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EDITION

A Twenty Years’ Retrospect

It is difficult to say whether the reading of essays which hold the hopes of twenty years ago arouses more of satisfaction or of disappointment.

It is satisfactory that dock labour is organised, that dock directors employ more permanent hands, that workmen are eligible as guardians, that houses have been built fit for habitation, that free libraries, open spaces, and baths have been opened, that the poor-law administration has been made more human, that public opinion against impurity is strengthened, that some of the restrictions imposed by a narrow code on children’s education have been removed, that twenty thousand or thirty thousand children spend their holidays in the country, that the status of young servants has been raised, that the People’s Palace and polytechnics have been provided, that universal pensions and agricultural training farms are within the range of practical politics, that the offer of the best—the best pictures, the best music—to all is not so unusual, that the entertainment of the poor as equals is not so uncommon, and that in London, in British great towns, in America, and on the Continent University settlements have been started.

It is most satisfactory that town councils have been roused to a sense of their powers, and have been made to feel ‘that their reason of being is not political but social, that their duty is not to protect the pockets of the rich but to save the people.’

But it is disappointing to reflect how little all these improvements mean: how poor the poor remain, how inadequate
are the average wages to meet the needs of life, how vast is
the body of labour still unorganised, how low is the standard
of health in East London compared with that of West London,
how altogether below the requirement is the provision of
libraries, baths, and open spaces. It is disappointing that
emotion still governs methods of relief, that the rich give to
relieve their own feelings rather than to relieve the poor, that
the busy and kindly start new charities rather than work with
others; that the absenteeism of those 'who might be channels
of civilising influences' is still the rule; that it remains true
to say that 'the poor die before their time, suffer unduly for
want of air, space, and water, and have not the happiness
which comes from calm and knowledge.' It is disappointing
that so little has been done to advance higher education.

It is most disappointing that during all the years there
has been no attempt to fit the Church for its work, no reform
in the most unreformed of national institutions: that the
purse or the patron still appoint to the cure of souls, that the
incumbent remains an autocrat, and that its vast income is so
administered that one man is rich on his thousands a year,
while another starves on fifty pounds a year.

There is much in a retrospect of twenty years to rouse
satisfaction, and much to rouse disappointment.

On the whole it may be said that the standard of comfort
in the East End has risen. The people are better housed, better
fed, and better clad; they take more pleasure, and take it in
more wholesome ways; there is less rowdyism in the streets,
and there is now some interest in public affairs. But while
this statement is true if it be taken generally, it must at
the same time be remembered that there are thousands of
families who live on the brink of starvation with low and
uncertain wages, that there are many dwellings still unfit for
occupation, that there is a large degraded class, and that
the causes which make for poverty are still operating. On
the whole, too, it may be said that the level of life has not
risen; there is no greater pleasure in the play of the
imagination, no higher reach for hopes, no greater admiration
for whatsoever things are beautiful, good, or virtuous. The people pursue what is comfortable, and value the good they can measure with eye, touch, or taste. But again, while this is true as a general statement, it must be remembered that there are some who have found in reading and study a new means of life, men and women who deny themselves comforts to buy a book, and find more pleasure in a flower or a story than in a big dinner. These exist to show that without more wages or more leisure people might live their lives on a higher plane.

Lastly, on the whole, it may be said that there has been a decrease of old-fashioned honesty, an increase of impertinence and of the habit of gambling. Under the influence of teaching, some good and some bad, stealing and lying no longer rank among the chief vices. Men and women who would not commit a vulgar theft or pick a pocket, think it little evil to cheat the railway or tramcar company, to claim as property chance findings, or to 'best' a tradesman or employer. There is much talk about what is right in little matters, but the 'robust conscience' which damns as wrong any departure from simple honesty and truth is often wanting. Mothers are no longer so stern about truth speaking in their children, they often pass over lies as of little consequence, and in the schools the accepted assumption is that an excuse is an untruth. A workman's word can hardly be counted as his bond, and a promise even to join a party is not one on which to place dependence.

It is this want of honesty which makes suspicion so common in many working-class organisations, and makes it hard for leaders to lead. When it is held to be sufficient excuse for a theft that the thief was in need of bread, it becomes an easy transition to justify any action by which a poor man is benefited at the expense of a rich one. Old-fashioned puritanical morality has, in fact, been replaced by the sentiment which makes suffering the one evil, and counts that action good which, even by lying and thieving, reduces suffering. The Puritan with his 'nonconformist'
conscience, who long survived among working-people, is not now so common.

In the same way there seems to be an increase of what for want of a better word may be called 'impertinence,' or of that sort of independence which refuses to confess any ignorance or allow any superiority, which never goes softly or hesitates to rush in where angels fear to tread. There is, of course, a good side to this independence as there is to every kind of independence. It means that people are no longer servile or unconscious of strength. But such impertinence is very ugly, whether it be in the young lad who 'cheeks' his elder, or in the girl who shows her emancipation by drinking and shouting on Hampstead Heath, or in the man who thinks his opinion on Finance, on the Eastern Question, on Education, or on Religion to be as good as that of any expert. There are many signs of this self-trust—children choose their own schools; boys and girls take their lives in their hands and leave their homes to live in lodgings; the greatest admiration is professed in the clubs for 'smartness'; and the acknowledgment that any reverence is due to man—even to God—is growing rare. Obedience is not counted among the virtues, because there seems to be no one greater than self.

But perhaps even more noticeable than decrease of honesty and increase of impertinence is the growth of the habit of gambling. Of this there is no question. The result of a race is of more general interest than a vote in Parliament. The broad sheets of the evening papers offer such results in the biggest type, and a boy selling such papers is even in a poor street the centre of a crowd of eager buyers. The talk in the clubs is about bets, about races, about games; the boys in the schools soon get into corners to play games for ha'pence, and it is whispered—but of this there is little evidence—that women take shares in books. The increased number of newspapers and the spread of education, together with the need of excitement in a stimulating age, may account for the growth of the habit without causing anxiety. It is not that
people are worse, it is only that they have more means for an indulgence against which a fight has always to be fought.

In fact, it may be questioned whether any of these signs which are so disturbing are other than marks of growth—wreckage left by a high wave in the rising tide.

There needed a hard blow to destroy the worship of property and the callousness to suffering; it is not altogether loss if in the destruction the sense of honesty is for the moment lost, to be re-established on a firmer foundation.

It was necessary that idols which had won reverence should be destroyed—sham greatesses, sham worth; and it is not wholly loss if for the moment the ideals—real greatness, real worth—be out of sight, to be again revealed and command heart-felt reverence.

It could not be that a workman’s life should be always divided between sleep and toil, it was necessary that he, too, should have excitement, an interest outside the getting and spending of a narrow home. If for a moment he has found that excitement in gambling, it need not be so always. As he gets more leisure—not enough to make him dull as leisure now makes many of the rich dull—he will find excitement in thinking, in beauty, and in travel.

But for those who live at the moment when dishonesty, impertinence, and gambling are so evident, it is not sufficient that they sit down with vague hopes of better times. If therefore, as a conclusion of a retrospect of twenty years, it be allowed that these signs exist, while the level of comfort has risen and the level of life remains stationary, the question to be answered is, what is still to be done?

1. The process by which the level of comfort has been raised must be continued ‘without haste and without rest’; without the haste of those who, because of success, cry out for more State interference, and without the rest of those who think enough has been done. It cannot be too often repeated that the standard reached is not sufficiently high, that wages of twenty-five shillings or even forty shillings a week are not
sufficient, and that there are thousands who cannot count even on this wage.

The poor remain too poor, and there are great neighbourhods where good health and happiness are impossible. There must, therefore, be increased organisation of labour, further demolition of unhealthy houses, a great increase to the number of free libraries, open spaces, and baths, and a better Poor Law administration, so that the old may be cared for, the unskilled trained, and the idler disciplined. Town councils must go on in their activity to make the conditions of living as pleasant in poor as in rich quarters.

At the same time the measure of philanthropy must be increased. There must be more sharing of the best, a more equal intermingling of classes, more generous giving to provide holidays and means of enjoyment, and, with all the giving, there must be a more ready disposition to restrain the emotion which wants to please itself, and the vanity which wants its charity called by its own name.

It seems as if it were harder to control than to stir the desire to give. At any rate a great hindrance to raising the level of comfort is unwise giving, and the best help is that giving which, sparing nothing, devotes itself to the care of one who is in need. If the goodwill which now takes shape in attempts to relieve the masses and in forming societies could be shown in individual efforts to meet the needs of individuals the change would be marked.

By the State provision of means of health, education and recreation, and by the passionate patience of philanthropy the level of comfort might be further raised. But by the State provision of means of living and by the forming of new relief societies success would not so certainly follow. The old formula that the State should provide 'needs and not wants' seems the best, and the aim of reformers should be the nationalisation of luxury. As may be learnt by the example of America, the strength of a nation depends on the strength of the individuality of its members. State provision of those things after which individuals certainly seek, limits the
development of individuals, and the provision of food—perhaps even of leisure—might make many men listless who are now energetic and creative.

Signs of the readiness with which men give up struggle to become greedy gamblers are not wanting, and a few energetic natures must beware of judging the mass by themselves. Necessity remains for the many the mother of manhood.

It would be unfair to the poor if, in haste to remove the fear of poverty, they were robbed of the qualities which now distinguish them as a class from that of the leisureed rich. They can—as it has been shown during the last twenty years—without any demoralising help get increased comfort, and if reformers will believe and not make haste the progress will continue. There is ample work for all reformers if they will make poor neighbourhoods as clean, as healthy, as well provided with means of study, cleanliness, and play as rich neighbourhoods. These things stimulate and do not paralyse energy.

2. A further answer to the question, 'What is still to be done?' is that there must be an organised effort to spread higher education. The following letter puts the need to-day as truly as when it was written in the 'Times,' October 24, 1892.

SOME EAST LONDON NEEDS

Sir,—Twenty years ago the elementary schools of East London were few and poor. There were no night schools attractive to adults, and hardly any night classes. Great advertising efforts brought out a handful of people to hear Dr. W. B. Carpenter at a central hall, and twenty students was considered a good attendance at a University Extension class. All is changed. There are now in the Tower Hamlets fifty-five Board schools, providing good teaching in good surroundings for over 60,000 children; in many the teaching approaches that of a secondary school, and in some manual training is given. There are now night schools where French,
German, book-keeping, shorthand, and drawing may be learnt and athletics enjoyed. There are technical classes at the People's Palace and at a few smaller institutes, where thousands of young people get instruction, which will increase their powers of earning, and the Toynbee Hall University Extension Lectures are attended by 800 students. So much has been done; but the 'done' is only a platform whence better to see 'the vast undone.'

Looking from this platform the first need of East London seems to be more centres of teaching. Its size is never imagined, and it is rarely seen. It has no rich suburbs, and rich passengers do not get familiar with its length and depth as they pass to and from their homes. East London is unknown to Londoners, and people talk contentedly, as if the People's Palace afforded sufficient teaching and recreation. Six such institutions could hardly do what it is imagined that this one is central enough and large enough to do for a million persons packed in an area extending over Bethnal Green, Hackney, Limehouse, and Poplar. The People's Palace is about equal to the wants of Bow and Mile End.

The second need is greater organisation in the supply of means of education. Elementary schools are within the reach of everyone, but this cannot be said of secondary or technical schools.

The third and greatest need is for that teaching for which the demand is least. Everyone most needs the good he least wants. Everyone will probably at last get what he wants, but still remain without what he needs to make his manhood full. East Londoners want the education, technical or other, which will increase their wage-earning power. They will get such education, but they will still need the education which is life filling.

Such are some of the present needs of East London. They are the harder to bear because close at hand are the means for their adequate supply. There are several City Companies which could do for other districts what the Drapers' have done for Bow. There is Gresham College, which, amid
the talk about a teaching university, might occupy not the least promising area for its future efforts. There is the Mitchell Trust, the limited scope of which might, without harm to anyone, be extended. On the very threshold of East London there is the enormously wealthy charity of Sir John Cass, which has escaped generation after generation of Charity Commissioners, and almost recalls the old story of Dulwich College.

If it be assumed that the School Board, the parochial charities, and the County Council will ultimately supply and organise elementary, secondary, and technical education, there will still be a great field open which might be occupied by these 'charities.'

When, by existing means of education, men's ability for earning has been increased, they will still need the knowledge which will furnish the present with memories of the past, which will develop taste, draw out reverence, and aid the powers of expression. If men have the teaching which fits them for work, they need also the teaching which fits them for leisure. If they have the skill which gives self-respect, they need also the knowledge which humbles. The Tower Hamlets, which is only a part of East London, has 500,000 inhabitants. All of these are working people, in the sense that all have begun earning early in life, that they have not had the leisure in which to wait for the voice of the 'mighty sum of things for ever speaking,' nor have they lived amid the treasures collected in leisure. At the same time, they have capacities equal to any for enjoyment and giving enjoyment. Few East Londoners do enjoy Tennyson, all would do so. Few increase beauty, many could do so. One boy found by chance in a back street and brought under fostering influences, is the most artistic copper-worker in London; others have developed less successfully, but in the greater number their talents perish.

If, in the Tower Hamlets, professors in history, literature, art, and the principles of science were established—if, that is, men of ability were selected, paid 500l. a year, pledged to each freely in different halls on four or five days a week,
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and to live in London—the first step towards supplying a great need would have been taken. It would then be possible to arrange during three years courses of study to which a student might commit himself or herself with full assurance, while the fact of the existence of professors known as ‘East Londoners’ would make higher teaching more acceptable.

The efforts of the Toynbee Hall Committee of the University Extension Society are necessarily limited, but they tend to prove the practicability of such a scheme. Dr. Gardiner has now for many years taught a class of over a hundred to enjoy history for its own sake rather than for that of examiners; Dr. Fison has found, out of a large class in the principles of electrical science, a sufficient number of earnest students to induce him to give them special teaching, and history lectures which have been offered in Limehouse and Poplar have attracted hundreds of workmen and workwomen. Enough has been done to show that, with opportunities, the people of East London would rise to take in knowledge. Enough cannot be done, to do what is possible, for want of money. The Toynbee Hall Committee, with great difficulty, got together 200l.; it cannot pay the teachers a fair wage, it cannot arrange courses for continuous study, and it can give no security of permanence to students or teachers. The funds of unused or undeveloped charities wisely used might set on foot a movement in East London which would end in the formation of a teaching university, shaped so as to meet the needs of the people.

The ‘Times’ has helped before when there have been big things to do, and I would now invoke its help in a work beyond the power of most existing agencies of reform. I am faithfully yours,

Samuel A. Barnett.

St. Jude’s Vicarage, Whitechapel.

October 20.

3. Further social reform on the lines proved to be good—a large measure of higher education—will supply some of East London’s needs. But there is a greater need which it is
not easy to meet. The people are as sheep without a shepherd, they have not the master-thought, the principle, the knowledge of God to control them in all their ways. They are not conscious of a Will which is guiding them and everybody, which must be done, and on which they might rest. They need to be taught of God.

The Church exists for the purpose. It was fitted at the Reformation to meet the requirements of a time made new by the invention of printing; it has not been fitted to the requirements of a time made new by as great discoveries and inventions. It is not, therefore, surprising that it has lost its hold on the people. The means of reform suggested twenty years ago may not seem to go far, but when once an institution is brought into touch with the popular will its further reform is certain. The chief thing to be done is for those who believe in God to commend that belief, so that the popular will may shape a Church which will teach of God.

Belief in God through Jesus Christ is something very different to accepting Christ as a social leader. There are many Christians who are practically atheists, and some books which demand reverence for the name of Christ and reverential attitude at services are noticeable chiefly for their godlessness. Those who believe in God must commend this belief by showing that it bears on all the relations of life, that it is the groundwork of their politics, their business, their pleasure, and their home relations. They must show they have a Master, and commend His service to those who are weary of doing what they like. They must, as Ivan Ivanovitch, say by all their actions 'How otherwise?' and show themselves to be servants, humble as those who do another's will, strong as those who have Almightyness behind them, and glad as those who have learnt that Almightyness is All Love.

If those with this belief will come and live in East London, their lives will meet the greatest need and elaborate a Church which will justify God.

S. A. B.
PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM

THE POVERTY OF THE POOR\(^1\)

It is useless to imagine that the nation is wealthier because in one column of the newspaper we read an account of a sumptuous ball or of the luxury of a City dinner, if in another column there is a story of 'death from starvation.' It is folly, and worse than folly, to say that our nation is religious because we meet her thousands streaming out of the fashionable churches, so long as workhouse schools and institutions are the only homes open to her orphan children and homeless waifs. The nation does not consist of one class only; the nation is the whole, the wealthy and the wise, the poor and the ignorant. Statistics, however flattering, do not tell the whole truth about increased national prosperity, or about progress in development, if there is a pauper class constantly increasing, or a criminal class gaining its recruits from the victims of poverty.

The nation, like the individual, is set in the midst of many and great dangers, and, after the need of education and religion has been allowed, it will be agreed that all other defences are vain if it be impossible for the men and women and children of our vast city population to reach the normal standard of robustness.

The question then arises, Why cannot and does not each man, woman, and child attain to the normal standard of robustness? The answers to this question would depend as much on the answerer as they do in the game of 'Old Soldier.'

\(^1\) Reprinted, by permission, from the National Review of July 1886, when it came out under the title of 'Our National Defences.'
The teetotallers would reply that drink was the cause, but against this sweeping assertion I should like to give my testimony, and it has been my privilege to live in close friendship and neighbourhood of the working classes for nearly half my life. Much has been said about the drinking habits of the poor, and the rich have too often sheltered themselves from the recognition of the duties which their wealth has imposed on them, by the declaration that the poor are unhelpable while they drink as they do. But the working classes, as a rule, do not drink. There are, undoubtedly, thousands of men, and, alas! unhappy women too, who seek the pleasure, or the oblivion, to be obtained by alcohol; but drunkenness is not the rule among the working classes, and, while honouring the work of the teetotallers, who give themselves up to the reclamation of the drunken, I cannot agree with them in their answer to the question. Drink is not the main cause why the national defence to be found in robust health is in such a defective condition.

Land reformers, socialists, co-operators, democrats would, in their turn, each provide an answer to our question; but, if examined, the root of each would be the same—in one word, it is Poverty, and this means scarcity of food.

Let us now go into the kitchen and try and provide, with such knowledge as dietetic science has given us, for a healthily hungry family of eight children and father and mother. We must calculate that the man requires 20 oz. of solid food per day, i.e. 16 oz. of carbonaceous or strength-giving food and 4 oz. of nitrogenous or flesh-forming food. (The army regulations allow 25 oz. a day, and our soldiers are recently declared on high authority to be underfed.) The woman should eat 12 oz. of carbonaceous and 3 oz. of nitrogenous food; though if she is doing much rough, hard work, such as all the cooking, cleaning, washing of a family of eight children necessitate, she would probably need another ounce per day of the flesh-repairing food. For the children, whose ages may vary from four to thirteen, it would be as well to estimate that they would each require 8 oz. of carbonaceous and 2 oz.
of nitrogenous food per day: in all, 92 oz. of carbonaceous and 28 oz. of nitrogenous foods per day.\

For the breakfast of the family we will provide oatmeal porridge with a pennyworth of treacle and another pennyworth of tinned milk. For dinner they can have Irish stew, with 1½ lb. of meat among the ten, a pennyworth of rice, and an addition of twopennyworth of bread to obtain the necessary quantity of strength-giving nutriment. For tea we can manage coffee and bread, but with no butter, and not even sugar for the children; and yet, simple fare as this is, it will have cost 2s. 5d. to feed the whole family, and to obtain for them a sufficient quantity of strength-giving food; and even at this expenditure they have not been able to get that amount of nitrogenous food which is necessary for the maintenance of robust health.

A little table of exact cost and quantities might not be uninteresting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Carbonaceous</th>
<th>Nitrogenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAKFAST—Oat Porridge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Oatmeal</td>
<td>2½ d.</td>
<td>14 oz.</td>
<td>3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1½ d.</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
<td>1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⅔ lb. Treacle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 oz.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DINNER—IRISH STEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Meat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3½ oz.</td>
<td>3½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 lb. Potatoes</td>
<td>2½ d.</td>
<td>14 oz.</td>
<td>2 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1¼ lb. Onions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5½ oz.</td>
<td>1½ oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few Carrots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>½ oz.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ lb. Rice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 oz.</td>
<td>1¼ oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Bread</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>13½ oz.</td>
<td>2¼ oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEA—BREAD AND COFFEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ lb. Bread</td>
<td>3⅔ d.</td>
<td>22½ oz.</td>
<td>3⅔ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Coffee</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>¹/₄ oz.</td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2¼ oz.</td>
<td>1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>92 oz.</td>
<td>18½ oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 To those who have had experience of children's appetites it may seem as if their daily food had been under-estimated. A growing lad
But note that the requisite quantities for the whole family are 92 oz. of carbonaceous and 28 oz. of nitrogenous substances.

Another day we might provide them with cocoa and bread for breakfast; lentil soup and toasted cheese for dinner; and rice pudding and bread for tea; but this fare presupposes a certain knowledge of cooking, which but few of the poor possess, as well as an acquaintance with the dietetic properties of food, which, at present, is far removed from even the most intelligent. This day’s fare compares favourably with yesterday’s meals in the matter of cost, being 2½d. cheaper, but it does not provide enough carbonaceous food, though it does not fall far short of the necessary 28 oz. of nitrogenous substances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Carbonaceous</th>
<th>Nitrogenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAKFAST—BREAD AND COCOA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ lb. Bread</td>
<td>3½ d.</td>
<td>22½ oz.</td>
<td>3½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ oz. Cocoa</td>
<td>1½ d.</td>
<td>14 oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>14 oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DINNER—LENTIL SOUP, TOASTED CHEESE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Lentils</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15 oz.</td>
<td>6 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. Cheese</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>5½ oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Bread</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>13½ oz.</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEA—RICE PUDDING AND BREAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ lb. Rice</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>10½ oz.</td>
<td>3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
<td>1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Bread</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>13½ oz.</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>86½ oz.</td>
<td>22½ oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of eleven or twelve will often eat more than his mother, but the eight children, being of various ages, will probably eat together about this quantity, and it is better, perhaps, to under- than over-state their requirements.
And how drear and uninteresting is this food compared to that on which people of another class normally live! No refreshing cups of afternoon tea; no pleasant fruit to give interest to the meal. Nothing but dull, keep-me-alive sort of food, and not enough of that to fulfil all Nature’s requirements.

But let us take another day’s meals, which can consist of hominy, milk, and sugar for breakfast; potato soup and apple-and-sago pudding for dinner; and fish and bread for tea; when fish is plentiful enough to be obtained at 3d. a pound, and when apples are to be got at 1½d. a pound, which economical housekeepers know is not often the case in London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Carbonaceous</th>
<th>Nitrogenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREAKFAST — HOMINY, MILK, SUGAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Hominy</td>
<td>3½ d.</td>
<td>17½ oz.</td>
<td>3½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½ pints Tinned Milk</td>
<td>3¼</td>
<td>4½ oz.</td>
<td>2¼ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 oz.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINNER — POTATO SOUP AND APPLE-AND-SAGO PUDDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 lb. Potatoes</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>17½ oz.</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1¼</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
<td>1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Rice</td>
<td>2¼</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
<td>½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Dripping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ lb. Apples</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>5 oz.</td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 oz. Sago</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>3½ oz.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 oz.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA—FISH AND BREAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ lb. Fish</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
<td>7½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lb. Bread</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 oz.</td>
<td>3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1¼</td>
<td>2½ oz.</td>
<td>1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 oz.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>86 oz.</td>
<td>23½ oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, however, we have spent 2s. 5d. on food, and even now have not quite got sufficient strength-giving or carbonaceous food.

An average of 2s. 4d. spent daily on food makes a total of 16s. 4d. at the week’s end, leaving the labourer earning his 1l.
a week 8s. 8d. with which to pay rent (and decent accommodation of two rooms in London cannot be had for less than 5s. 6d. or 6s. a week); to obtain schooling and lighting; to buy coals, clothes, and boots; to bear the expense of breakages and necessary replacements; to subscribe to a club against sickness or death; and to meet the doctor's bills for the children's illnesses or the wife's confinements. How is it possible? Can 8s. 8d. do so much? No, it cannot; and so food is stinted. The children have to put up with less than they need; the mother 'goes without sooner than let the children suffer,' and thus the new baby is born weakly and but half-nourished; the children develop greediness in their never-satisfied and but partly fed frames; and the father, too often insufficiently sustained, seeks alcohol, which, anyhow, seems to 'pick him up and hold him together,' though his teetotal mates assure him it is only a delusion.

And this is no fancy picture. I have now in my mind one Wilkins, a steady, rough, honest, sober labourer, fairly intelligent, and the father of thirteen children. The two eldest, girls of fourteen and fifteen, are already out at service; but the eleven younger, being under age, are still kept at school and supported by their father. He earns 1l. regularly. They rent the whole house at 12s. a week, and letting off part, stand themselves at a weekly rent of 5s. for three small rooms. Less than that, as the mother says, 'I could not nohow do with, what with all the washing for such a heavy family, and bathing the little ones, and him coming home tired of an evening, and needing a place to sit down in.' The wife is a decent body, but rough and uncultured; and as she is ignorant of the proper proportions of nitrogenous and carbonaceous substance necessary for the preservation of healthy life, as well as of the kinds of food in which they can be best found, she feeds her family even less nutritiously than she could do if she were better informed. Still, the whole wage could only feed them if it were all expended ever so wisely, leaving no margin for the requirements already mentioned.

Take Mrs. Marshall's family and circumstances. Mrs.
Marshall is, to all intents and purposes, a widow, her husband being in an asylum. She herself is a superior woman, tall and handsome, and with clean dapper ways and a slight hardness of manner that comes from bitter disappointment and hopeless struggling. She has four children, two of whom have been taken by the Poor Law authorities into their district schools—a better plan than giving outdoor relief, but, at the same time, one that has the disadvantage of removing the little ones from the home influence of a very good mother. Mrs. Marshall herself, after vainly trying to get work, was taken as a scrubber at a public institution, where she earns 9s. a week and her dinner. She works from six in the morning till five at night, and then returns to her fireless, cheerless room to find her two children back from school and ready for their chief meal; for during her absence their breakfast and dinner can only have consisted of bread and cold scraps. We will not dwell on the hardship of having to turn to and light the fire, tidy the room, and prepare the meal after having already done ten hours' scrubbing or washing. The financial question is now before us, and to that we will confine our thoughts. Out of her 9s. a week Mrs. Marshall pays 8s. 8d. for rent; 2d. for schooling; 1s. for light and firing (and this does not allow of the children having a morning fire before they go to school); 9d. she puts by for boots and clothing—and imagine what it must be to dress, so as to keep warm, three people on 17. 19s. a year!—and 6d. she pays for her bits of washing, for she cannot do them herself after all her heavy daily work. (Pause, though, for a moment to consider how Mrs. Marshall’s washerwoman must work when she does three changes of linen, aprons, sheets, and a tablecloth for 6d. a week.)

Deduct from 9s. weekly wage—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and 8s. 4d. is left with which to provide breakfast and tea for a hard-working woman for seven days in the week, dinner for Sunday, and three meals daily for two growing children of ten and eleven. We have seen how, even with economy, knowledge, strength, and time, proper food cannot be obtained for less than 1d. or 1½d. a meal, and this would make a weekly total of 5s. 11½d. 8s. 4d., with no time, with little knowledge, and only the remnants of strength which has been used up in earning the 8s. 4d., is all Mrs. Marshall has with which to meet these requirements.

And how do the rich look on these facts? 'Well! 9s. a week is very fair wage for an unskilled working woman,' was the remark I heard after I had told these facts to mine host at a country house, where we were eating the usual regulation dinner—soup, fish, entrée, joint, game, sweets, and hot-house fruits, said with the complacency of satisfaction which follows a glass of good wine. 'Yes, about the cost of your one dinner's wine!' replied one of the guests; but then he was probably one of those ill-balanced people who judge people by what they are rather than by what they have, and he may have thought that the sad, lone woman, with her noble virtues of industry, patience, and self-sacrificing love, had, despite her hard manners, more right to the good things of this world than the suave old man owning fourteen acres of lawn on which no children ever played, and stating, without shame, first, the fact that he used eighty-two tons of coal yearly to warm his own sitting-rooms, and then the opinion that 9s. a week was fair wage on which to support a good woman and bring up two children.

While this wage is considered a 'fair wage,' the children must remain half-nourished, and grow up incapable of honest toil and valuable effort. While this wage is accepted as a right and normal thing, it is useless to think that the nation will be guided through dangers by means of heavy subscriptions to schools, to hospitals, and sick-asylums. Robust health is impossible; so disease easily finds a home, and teachers vainly try to develop brains ill-supplied with blood.
By the doorway of semi-starvation disease is invited to enter and find a home among the masses of our wage-earning people.

Before me are the dietary tables of the Whitechapel Workhouse—an institution which stands (thanks to the self-devotion of its able Clerk) high on the list for careful management and economical administration. There are congregated the aged and infirm paupers, and among them are some of Nature's gentlefolk, the old and tired, who, having learnt a few of life's greatest lessons in their long walk through life, ought to be giving them to the young and untried, instead of wearying out their last days in the dull monotony of a useless and regulated existence. Their dietary table allows them for breakfast and supper one pint of tea (made of one ounce to a gallon of water) and five ounces of bread and a tiny bit of butter. For dinner they have meat three times a week, pea-soup and bread twice, suet pudding once, and Irish stew on the other day. For the sake of comparison I will make a food table of this diet, based on the same calculations of food value as those that have been previously made for the family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Carbonaceous</th>
<th>Nitrogenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAKFAST AND SUPPER—TEA, BREAD AND BUTTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 oz. Bread</td>
<td>5 1/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Butter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 pint Milk</td>
<td>less than 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DINNER—MEAT AND POTATOES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 oz. Meat (cooked)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 oz. Potatoes</td>
<td>1 1/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz. Bread</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see that the total allowance comes only to 10 1/2 oz. of carbonaceous food and 2 1/2 oz. of nitrogenous food, against
the estimated quantity of 16 oz. carbonaceous and 4 oz. nitrogenous, which is the necessary allowance for ordinary people, and against the 25 oz. carbonaceous and 5 oz. nitrogenous, which is the regulation diet of the Royal Engineers during peace. It is true that these old folk do not need so much food, for their bodies have ceased to grow and develop, and in aged persons the wear of the frame does not require such replenishment as in the case with young and middle-aged people; but even with this partial diet we find that the cost of maintaining each of these old people is, for food alone, 8s. 11d. per head per week.

Here, then, we have a fact on which a calculation is easy to make, and which, when made, forces us to see that the workman cannot keep his family as well as the pauper is kept. Even on this simple fare it would cost him close on 8s. a week to support himself so as to give him the strength to earn his daily bread; while, if we imagine his family to consist of a wife and six children, we find that his weekly food-bills would amount to £. 8s., calculating his requirements on the same basis as in the previous instances.

If we take, therefore, the case of a skilled workman earning his 2l. a week, we still find that, even when adequately fed (and keep in mind the plainness and unattractiveness of the diet), he has only 12s. a week to supply all other necessaries, and out of which to lay by, not only against old age and sickness, but against that 'rainy day' and 'out of work from slackness' which so often occur for weeks together in the weather chart of our artisan population.

Or take another case, that of Mr. and Mrs. Stoneman, excellent folk; the wife, a woman of such force and originality of character, such patience and sweet persistency, as would make her an ornament in any class; the husband an honest, steady man, not, perhaps, so clever as his wife, but loving and admiring her none the less for that. They have six children: the two eldest at work; the youngest a sweet tiny thing, as spotlessly clean as water and care can keep it in
this mud-coloured atmosphere of Whitechapel. Her husband earns 28s. a week, excepting when bad illness, lasting sometimes six and eight weeks, reduces his wages to nothing; and then the sick man, his wife, and four children have to live, pay rent, firing, and ‘doctor’s stuff’ on the club-money of 14s. a week, for the boys’ earnings can only support themselves.

Which of us would consider that he could supply food and sick-luxuries for even one person on 14s. a week, the sum fixed by the rich as board wages for an unneeded manservant?

On the face of it this family is perhaps exceptionally well-off, for the two big lads in it earn, the one 5s. the other 7s. a week, which brings the united weekly wage up to 35s. a week. Mrs. Stoneman is a friend of mine, and, in response to my request, she weighed all the food at every meal, and here is the result.

At the time, however, that this was done Mrs. Stoneman’s children had been sent by the Children’s Country Holiday Fund into the country for a fortnight’s holiday. We must therefore suppose the family to consist only of six, and the necessary quantity of food to sustain them in good healthy working condition would be 76 oz. of carbonaceous food and 19 oz. of nitrogenous food.

### Sunday Meals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Strength-giving</th>
<th>Flesh-repairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAKFAST—BREAD AND BUTTER AND FISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Bread</td>
<td>2 d.</td>
<td>11½ oz.</td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ oz. Butter</td>
<td>1½ d.</td>
<td>1 oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Haddock</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz. Tea</td>
<td>½ d.</td>
<td>2 oz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Sugar</td>
<td>½ d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>½ d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sunday Meals—(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Strength-giving</th>
<th>Flesh-repairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dinner—Beef and Vegetables, Apple Pudding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. 3 oz. Beef.</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lb. 10 oz. Potatoes</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. Beans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Bread</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 lb. Flour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. Lard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. Apples</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/8 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tea—Bread and Butter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 lb. Bread</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>6 3/4</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz. Butter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 oz. Tea</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/8 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supper—Bread and Cheese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. Bread</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 lb. Cheese</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3 11/8</td>
<td>67 3/4</td>
<td>14 1/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wednesday Meals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Strength-giving</th>
<th>Flesh-repairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakfast—Bread and Butter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lb. Bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1/8 oz. Butter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 oz. Tea</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz. Sugar</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1 3/4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dinner—Bacon Pudding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. Bacon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lb. Potatoes</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 lb. Flour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz. Suet.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Wednesday Meals (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Strength-giving</th>
<th>Flesh-repairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tea—Bread and Butter</td>
<td>s. d.</td>
<td>oz.</td>
<td>oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lbs. Bread</td>
<td></td>
<td>4½ 21</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Butter</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz. Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supper—Bread and Cheese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¾ lb. Bread</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Cheese</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 6½</td>
<td>77½</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saturday Meals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Strength-giving</th>
<th>Flesh-repairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast—Bread and Butter</td>
<td>s. d.</td>
<td>oz.</td>
<td>oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ lb. Bread</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 oz. Butter</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner—Bread and Cheese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lb. Bread</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¾ lb. Cheese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pint Milk, Coffee</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea—Bread and Butter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lb. 4 oz. Bread</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>20½</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Butter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Herrings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ oz. Sugar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ pint Tinned Milk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supper—Bread and Cheese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 oz. Bread</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ lb. Cheese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 2½</td>
<td>66½</td>
<td>16½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This is the food-table of one of the best of managers. It could not well be simpler, and yet we see that it fails every day, sometimes to the extent of one-third, in providing sufficient nitrogenous or flesh-repairing food; but even so, the cost for the three days makes a total of 8s. 8½d., or, say, on an average, 3s. a day. Thus it took 1l. 1s. a week to feed this family simply and wholesomely at a time when two of its hungry members of eight and eleven were away. The weekly rent to house it in two rooms takes 5s. 7d.; to educate the school-going members, 7d. a week must be paid; to keep the fires and lights going (and this, of course, is more expensive than if the fuel could be got in in large quantities) demands 2s. 6d. a week; and to provide washing materials another 1s. must be deducted.

When these outgoings are met there remains but 4s. 4d. with which to provide the food of the two then absent children, to pay club subscriptions for three people (because each of the working members is in a sick-club and burial club), to procure boots, clothes, and to lay by against the days of illness, slackness, and old age.

Now these are the facts, which, summed up in a sentence, amount to this, that while wages are at the present rate the large mass of our people cannot get enough food to maintain them in robust health—and bodily health is here alone considered.

No mention has been made of the food a man requires to keep his whole nature in robust health; of the books, the means of culture, the opportunities of social intercourse, which are as necessary for his mental health and development as food and drink are for his bodily. No account has been taken of all that each human being needs to keep his spiritual nature alive. The quiet times in the country or by the sea, the knowledge of Nature's mysteries, the opportunities for the cultivation of natural affection. 'Yes, it is seven years since me and my daughter met,' I heard a gentle old lady of sixty-nine say the other day, one of God's aristocracy, the upper class in virtue and unselfishness. 'You see, she
lives a pretty step from here, and moving about is not to be thought of when money is so scarce.'

The body's needs are the most exacting; they make themselves felt with daily recurring persistency, and, while they remain unsatisfied, it is hard to give time or thought to the mental needs or the spiritual requirements; but if our nation is to be wise and righteous, as well as healthy and strong, they must be considered. A fair wage must allow a man, not only to adequately feed himself and his family, but also to provide the means of mental cultivation and spiritual development. Indeed, some humanitarians assert that it should be sufficient to give him a home wherein he may rest from noise, with books, pictures, and society; and there are those who go so far as to suggest that it should be sufficient to enable him to learn the larger lessons which travellers gain from other nations, as well as the teaching which the great dumb teachers wait to impart to 'those with ears to hear' of fraternity, purity, and eternal hope.

Why is it that our wage-earners cannot get this? Why is it that, as we indulge in such dreams, they sound impossible and almost impracticable, though no reader of this Review will add undesirable? Is it because our nation has not fought Ignorance with pointed weapons, and by its knights of proved prowess and valour? Or is it because our rulers have not recognised the greed of certain classes or individuals as a national evil, and struggled against it with the strength of unity? It cannot be the want of money in our land which causes so many to be half-fed, and cry silently from want of strength to make a noise. As we stand at Hyde Park Corner, or wander in among the miles of streets of 'gentlemen's residences' in the West End, our hearts are gladdened at the sight of the wealth that is in our land; but they would be glad with a deeper gladness if Wilkins was not getting slowly brutalised by his struggle, if there were a chance of Alice and Johnnie Marshall growing up as Nature meant them to grow, or if clever Mrs. Stoneman's patient efforts could be crowned

1 The National Review.
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with success. Money in plenty is in our midst, but cruel, blinding Poverty keeps her company, and our nation cannot boast herself of her wealth while half her people are but partly fed, and too poor to use their minds or to aspire after holiness.

By the optimist we may be told that all mention of charitable aid has been omitted; that in such a case as that of Wilkins, or of Mrs. Marshall, there would be aid from the philanthropic; that old clothes would do something to replenish the wardrobe, otherwise to be kept supplied by 11. 19s. a year; and that scraps and broken victuals find their way from most back doors into the homes of the poor. But, though this may be true when the poor are scattered among the rich, it is not true of that neighbourhood which I know best, where, through miles of streets, the income of each resident does not exceed 80s. a week, and where the four-roomed houses (as a rule, let out to two or three families) are unrelieved by a single house inhabited by only one family, or where they 'keep a servant.'

The advocates of children's penny dinners may take these facts as a strong argument in favour of their scheme, and feel that in this simple method is the solution of the difficulty. But those who so think cannot have considered the question in all its bearings. If feeding the children enables us to limit the power of disease, it does so by putting fresh weapons into the hands of certain classes or individuals, whose greed is so ill-curbed or ineffectively conquered as to be nothing loth to take advantage of every opportunity of working its cruel will.

If the children are fed at school it enables the mother to go out to work. The supply of female labour is thus increased, and married women can offer their work at lower wages than widows or single ones, because their labour is only supplementary to that of their husbands. The consequence is that wages go down, because more women are in the labour market than are needed, and those get the work who will take it for the least remuneration. Thus, though Mrs. Harris may get work, her children being 'now fed by the ladies round at the
school,' she does so at the expense of lowering Jane Metcalf's wages; and, as Jane is working to help her widowed mother to keep the four younger children off the parish, the only result is that Tommie and Lizzie and the two baby Metcalfs get worse food, and Jane finds life harder, and sometimes sees temptation through magnifying-glasses.

Besides these economic results which must inevitably follow the plan of feeding the children on any large scale, there are others which ensue from the lightening of parental responsibility, and these everyone who knows the poor can foresee without the gift of prophecy; the idle father is made more idle, the gossiping mother less controlled, and from the drunken parent is taken the last feeble bond which binds him to sobriety and its hopeful consequences. But perhaps as important as any of these results is the evil which follows the taking the children from the home influence. In our English love of home is one of the hopes for the future; and not the least important as a moral training ground is the family dinner-table. There the mother can teach the little lessons of good manners and neat ways, and the larger truths of unselfishness and thoughtfulness. There the whole family can meet, and from the talks over the meals, during the time which, as things now are, is perhaps the only leisure of the busy mechanic, may grow that sympathy between the older and younger people which must refresh and gladden both. No; it is not by any charitable effort that this poverty must be fought. A national want must be met by a national effort, and the thoughts of the political economist, which have hitherto been devoted to the question of production and accumulation of wealth, must now be turned to the problem of its right use and distribution, recognising that 'the wise use of wealth in developing a complete human life is of incomparably the greater moment both to men and nations.' While more than half the English people are poor, weak, and unable to live their best life or reach their true standard of humanity, it is useless to congratulate ourselves on our national supremacy or class our nation as wealthy and strong.
Some economists will reply that these sad conditions are but the result of our freedom; that the boasted 'liberty' in our land must result in the few strong making themselves stronger, and in the many weak suffering from their weakness. But is this necessarily so? Is this the only result to be expected from human beings having the power to act as they please? Are not love, goodwill, and social instincts as truly parts of human character as greed, selfishness, and sulkiness; and may we not believe that human nature is great enough to care to use its freedom for the good of all? Men have done noble things to obtain this freedom. They have loved her with the ardour of a lover's love, with the patience of a silver wedded life; and now that they have her, is she only to be used to injure the weak, and to make life cruel and almost impossible to the large majority? 'What is the right use of freedom?' The ancient answer was, 'To love God.' And can we love God whom we have not seen when we love not our brother whom we have seen?

Henrietta O. Barnett.
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out India; he used, that is to say, his cattle dung for fuel, neglected stall feeding, never sowed fodder crops or used artificial manure. His out-turn was consequently low. If he failed to pay rent, ranging from five rupees an acre, for the land, the house was liable to seizure. Most of these tenants seemed to be possessed of cattle and jewels, but they were said to be in debt to the money-lender, who everywhere has risen to thrive on the greater security of tenure given to tenants by British rule. They all appeared to be absorbed in the one pursuit of caring for the cattle, and there was none of the variety of pleasure or of pursuit evidenced in an English village by cottage gardens, by the playing-field, by the forge, by the hall, and the church. Only one in five hundred was able to read and write; and a bad harvest or a disease among the cattle would, we were told, reduce all to starvation.

These impressions about the poverty in India gathered during a short visit are supported by both the figures and the conclusions of many experts. Sir Henry Cunningham in his book on British India puts those figures and conclusions with admirable clearness, adding thereto weighty remarks drawn from men with long experience. 'It is probable,' he says, 'that 90 per cent. of the rural and 80 per cent. of the whole population of the country is closely connected with the land. Potters, weavers, and beggars, with the labourers, are the most necessitous. They number thirteen millions of adult males, and represent a population of forty millions, or about one-fifth of the entire population.' From another source it is gathered that, whereas in England the total yearly income of each member of the nation is 33l., and in Turkey 4l., in India it is only 2l. Sir Henry Cunningham also says; 'The experience of the army and gaols suggests that two millions of deaths annually arise from causes which are preventable—bad and insufficient food, and general insanitary conditions.'

'The labourer gets a wage ranging from 2d. to 4d. a day, or in other cases 3s. or 4s. a month, with or without a meal. In harvest time he gets a higher rate, sometimes twelve pounds or fourteen pounds of grain per day. As a rule he is absolutely
poor and resourceless.' 'Vast multitudes live at almost the lowest level compatible with continued existence.' Official evidence of the highest character makes it impossible to doubt that the condition of the tenantry in several parts of India is a peril to society and a disgrace to any civilised administration.

When a vast population lives at this level of poverty, without any wealthier neighbours from whom may come help or the inspiration of effort, without any possible lower position in which to seek safety, life must always be sad and misery very near. The people have neither hope nor fear; they increase and multiply till famine or disease sweeps them off by thousands.

Such facts and figures are disturbing, yet the impression left by a visit to the poor in India is not such as that left by a visit to the poor in England. The family income may be appallingly small, the household comforts may be nil, but the people have not the anxious, wearied look of our poor, nor are they conscious of want. A few pence a week will keep a family where it is unlawful to eat meat, where each member only needs two pounds of flour and four ounces of pulse a day, where the sun provides sufficient warmth, making both house and clothes to be unnecessary, and where the teaching of a thousand years serves to check the thought, 'I am as good as he; why should I not have as much?'

The Hindoo having, as he generally has, sufficient for the day, is happy, content to sleep, and is hardly to be urged to greater work by the offer of greater earnings. 'I have enough, why should I work for more?' is not an unusual answer, and the offer of a higher place is often refused lest it should involve more effort. The English poor suffer tortures by their anxiety and by their conscious degradation. They fear lest ill-health or bad trade should break up the home so hardly got together; they are conscious that neither their minds nor their bodies have their rights. The sight of the London poor rouses every visitor to sympathy and active beneficence. The sight of the Hindoo poor is apt to send the visitor away saying, 'They are content, let them alone.'
## Wednesday Meals—(continued)

| Quantity of Food   | Cost | Strength-giving | Flesh-repairing |
|--------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------
| **Tea—Bread and Butter** | s. d. | oz. | oz. |
| 3 lbs. Bread       | 4½   | 21  | 4½  |
| 2½ oz. Butter      | 2½   | 2   |    |
| ½ oz. Tea          | 1    |     |    |
| 2½ oz. Sugar       | 3    | 2   |    |
| ¾ pint Tinned Milk | ¾    | 4   | 4   |
| **Supper—Bread and Cheese** |      |     |     |
| ¾ lb. Bread        | 1    | 6½  | 2½  |
| 3 oz. Cheese       | 1½   | 2   | 1   |
| **Total**          | 2 6½ | 77½ | 16  |

## Saturday Meals

| Quantity of Food   | Cost | Strength-giving | Flesh-repairing |
|--------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------
| **Breakfast—Bread and Butter** | s. d. | oz. | oz. |
| 1¾ lb. Bread       | 2½   | 13½ | 2½  |
| 3 oz. Butter       | 3    | 2½  |    |
| 2½ oz. Sugar       | 1    | 3   |    |
| 1 pint Tinned Milk | 1½   | 1   | 2   |
| **Dinner—Bread and Cheese and Coffee** |     |     |     |
| 2½ lb. Bread       | 1    | 6½  | 2½  |
| ¾ lb. Cheese       | 4    | 2½  | 2½  |
| 1 pint Milk, Coffee| 1½   | 1½  | 1½  |
| **Tea—Bread and Butter and Fish** |      |     |     |
| 2 lb. 4 oz. Bread  | 3½   | 20½ | 3½  |
| 2½ oz. Butter      | 2½   | 2   |    |
| 2 Herrings         | 2    |     |    |
| 2½ oz. Sugar       | 3½   | 2   |    |
| ¾ pint Tinned Milk | ¾    | 1   | ¾   |
| **Supper—Bread and Cheese** |      |     |     |
| 14 oz. Bread       | 1¼   | 8½  | 1   |
| ¼ lb. Cheese       | 2    | 1   | 1¼  |
| **Total**          | 2 2½ | 66½ | 15½ |
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This is the food-table of one of the best of managers. It could not well be simpler, and yet we see that it fails every day, sometimes to the extent of one-third, in providing sufficient nitrogenous or flesh-repairing food; but even so, the cost for the three days makes a total of 8s. 8½d., or, say, on an average, 8s. a day. Thus it took 1l. 1s. a week to feed this family simply and wholesomely at a time when two of its hungry members of eight and eleven were away. The weekly rent to house it in two rooms takes 5s. 7d.; to educate the school-going members, 7d. a week must be paid; to keep the fires and lights going (and this, of course, is more expensive than if the fuel could be got in in large quantities) demands 2s. 6d. a week; and to provide washing materials another 1s. must be deducted.

When these outgoings are met there remains but 4s. 4d. with which to provide the food of the two then absent children, to pay club subscriptions for three people (because each of the working members is in a sick-club and burial club), to procure boots, clothes, and to lay by against the days of illness, slackness, and old age.

Now these are the facts, which, summed up in a sentence, amount to this, that while wages are at the present rate the large mass of our people cannot get enough food to maintain them in robust health—and bodily health is here alone considered.

No mention has been made of the food a man requires to keep his whole nature in robust health; of the books, the means of culture, the opportunities of social intercourse, which are as necessary for his mental health and development as food and drink are for his bodily. No account has been taken of all that each human being needs to keep his spiritual nature alive. The quiet times in the country or by the sea, the knowledge of Nature's mysteries, the opportunities for the cultivation of natural affection. 'Yes, it is seven years since me and my daughter met,' I heard a gentle old lady of sixty-nine say the other day, one of God's aristocracy, the upper class in virtue and unselfishness. ‘You see, she
'Did you ever see a happier people?' asked a rajah, who, himself rich under British protection, pointed to the crowd in the bazaar.

But there is more real danger in Indian content than in London discontent. Put the question to any one of these poor families we visited: 'What would happen in case of illness, failure of the rains, or bad trade?' The answer is short—'Starvation.' Put another question: 'What intelligent reason has anyone why he should resist a call on his passions?' The answer again is short—'None.' Multiply the answer by millions, and you have the cause of the two great facts which mark Indian history—'Famine' and 'Panic.'

So long as the people remain poor because of their own ignorance, and so long as they are content in their poverty, they are in danger of famine. Relief in the day of famine is almost impossible. Vain is it to cope with the hunger of millions, and one of the saddest photographs ever shown is that of an English official surrounded by a crowd of patient creatures, waiting, more like skeletons than human beings, until either he or death shall bring relief.

So long, too, as people remain ignorant and untrained to resist the moment's passion there is danger of panic. A suspicion of interference with established custom, the appearance of some fakir announcing portends and prophecies, some ill-considered or ill-supported act of Government, might at any moment rouse thousands to sudden anger, and encourage them to acts of murder.

The stock phrase of the congressman, 'A hundred thousand persons lie down daily insufficiently fed,' may rouse the hearts of Western hearers; the fact that a hundred million people are content to be poor, should rouse the hearts of those responsible for peaceful rule. Famine and panic lie underneath the thin crust of Indian content. The poor cannot be left alone. The means of help which exist, Voluntary and State, are worthy of consideration.
Voluntary Relief Agencies

'Is there any book which tells about this Society?' was a question asked by a Hindoo lad, as in his class reading he came across a passing reference to the Charity Organisation Society. The teacher naturally asked the cause of his interest, and found it to be in the consciousness of the harm done by the voluntary charity of the city. Hindoo temples and Mohammedan mosques are alike centres of relief, and one point in which these two very antagonistic systems meet is in the administration of charity. 'They cook so many hundreds of pounds of rice daily at the Durgah mosque,' boasted a Mohammedan; and if the traveller asks, 'Is there any charity among the Hindoos?' 'Of course,' is the answer; 'our religion requires us to give.'

Mohammedans and Hindoos have, therefore, an identical system. Gifts from the rich are gathered at the mosques or temples and distributed to all applicants. The whole power rests with their priests or teachers.

Hinduism as a popular religion is simply a system of customs organised by Brahmins. The people keep their caste rules, make offerings, boycott offenders, as they are directed by the Brahmins. The whole fabric of superstition under which Indian life is crushed is kept up by these men, and it is their influence which prevents the spread of education. If ever anyone is inclined to doubt the danger of priestcraft, a visit to India ought to dispel such doubts. He will find in the Brahmins a typical priesthood, and he will see how their unquestioned rule has degraded the people until they seem to be without power of clear thinking or of wide feeling. The Mohammedan system, on the contrary, has no place for a priest. Each man has his own relations with God. But in India the 'moulvies,' or teachers in the mosques, have assumed to be directors of the conscience and arbiters on questions of faith, and it is the complaint of some Mohammedans that this development is due to the influence of Hinduism. The administration of alms in both systems thus largely rests
with the priests and moulvis, and in both systems alms are given as a religious duty.

The pious give, not because their brothers have need, but to please the god, and it is nothing to them if their gifts are consumed by the priests or wasted on worthless objects. The priests give as priests—either to attract worshippers to their temple or to deliver their own souls. In each of the sacred Hindu cities thousands of pounds are yearly spent on feeding an idle population of Brahmans because it is meritorious to give to this caste; and there is no marriage feast, no funeral, where money and food are not given for the same purpose. In Bombay, alongside of some squalid huts occupied by families who can rarely enjoy enough food, is a fine stone building, newly erected, well furnished, and well served. It has been built and endowed to feed a hundred Brahmans daily.

In the Benares temples, where, herded with beasts, men worship gods in the likeness of their lusts, may be seen the depths to which priestcraft may degrade a nation; in the Benares streets, where always swarm crowds of fat, bold idlers, may be seen the effect of giving without humanity.

In Hyderabad, where the Mohammedans are in power, degradation is not such as among Hindus, but here 10 per cent. of the revenue, in addition to large private gifts, is spent on keeping armies of beggars who are descendants of orthodox families, and one well-known lawyer complained that almost every will he drew provided for the feeding of idle multitudes on certain holy days of the year.

Such voluntary charity, Hindu or Mohammedan, is altogether powerless to relieve poverty; it is rather one of the causes of poverty. Few natures, even in the West, resist the temptation of trying to get something for nothing. The Indians, who are less ready for work than the inhabitants of Europe, gamble away their strength as they wait the gift of a meal. It is no wonder that an intelligent lad, seeing the waste, the poverty, and the idleness, should wish to know about the Charity Organisation Society.

Much more effective 'voluntary charity' is, however, that
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provided among the Hindoos by their family system, and by
the bond laid on all the members of the family to support one
another. In one house it is thus common to find married
sons, widowed daughters and their children, all depending on
the father. 'I have five widows to support,' was the quite
reasonable excuse put in by a tenant asking remission of rent.
No one member of the family could be in want if another had
enough, and it would be impossible to find among the poor of
India such homeless, such desolate, such disinherited men
and women as occupy the casual wards and lodging-houses in
England.

But as a means of relief the system fails. Every member
of a family being bound to give to others is himself unable to
accumulate savings. The hardworking and successful man is
thus kept low by weak and very often idle relatives. He is
able to make no store for investment nor to save against bad
times, and the idle are encouraged to be more idle. He has
perhaps earned money as a mill-hand. He has returned, as
he invariably does, with his savings to his family in the
country, but the savings have then as likely as not to be spent
among the idle members.

The relief afforded by the family system is very like the
out-relief afforded by the English Poor Law. It draws the
savings from the thrifty, and helps the idle with a dole. It
prevents, indeed, utter loneliness and neglect, but it provokes
no gratitude. It checks enterprise and tends to make a dead
level of poverty, in which there are no richer people to act as
barriers against the flood of famine or of bad times.

The family system, as the giving of out-relief, has its
attraction, and visitors are often touched by the way in which
the strong hold on to the weak; but at the same time they
cannot fail to notice that idlers abound. In no country of the
world are there so few to be found who by individuality have
developed the resources of their country, or so many who
sleep by the wayside or idly dream with open eyes; and in no
country of the world is there so little resistance to the inroads
of famine.
Voluntary charity, be it that of alms or of the family, fails to meet the needs of the poor. In fact, the two elements which make charity effective, humanity and the power of association, are wanting. That quality of humanity which feels everything human to be akin seems to be dormant in India. Partly because in all things the people think too much of their gods, and partly because of their caste rules, they have not realised that they are their brothers' keepers. The chief duty of man seems to be to please his god, and when by a gift he has delivered himself of this duty, he thinks no more of his brother at the gate. 'God will take care of him; He at the last day will make it up to him,' is a sentiment often expressed in various phrases. Because the eyes of the people are fixed only on their gods, and because they live in the narrow trenches made by their caste rules, there can be no charity which is directed to meet human needs. A man must share his brother's burden before he can really help his brother, and he must care for him as a brother if he would realise his needs. The Indians, devoid of the humanity which is pained whenever another man suffers, sceptical of the power of the lowest to rise, cannot have the charity which will restrain itself or spend itself for another's good.

And with humanity there must also be association among the charitable, if charity is to be effective. In India there is as yet little power of forming associations. Old habits of distrust and suspicion are too strong, and conformity to any rule not founded on recognised authority seems too strange. Here and there a few associations are creeping into light. Most of these are formed for mutual help, bodies of men pledged to drink no strong drink or not to marry till of mature age. Some of them are formed to obtain privileges, of which the Congress movement is the greatest example. But few are intended to carry out reforms or to help the poor.

Voluntary charity in India, as in England, must have a pure source, and must flow from simple love to man because he is man. Charity which is given to please the gods or to relieve the feelings will not relieve poverty. Its current must
be strong, able to break down all barriers of self-interest or class-interest, but at the same time it must submit to flow within the limits erected by association and to the end approved as the best.

In India it is hopeless to look for such charity until education has developed the human instinct.

THE STATE AS AN AGENCY OF RELIEF.

India has no Poor Law, yet the chief concern of Government is the preservation of life among two hundred millions of poor people. All measures must obviously be ineffective so long as the people themselves are deficient in life-preserving qualities, such as confidence, enterprise and self-control.

Confidence, for example, is so rare that savings are not invested or even entrusted to a bank; they are turned into jewellery to burden the women’s fingers, toes, noses and ears, and are at last sold to provide a marriage feast. The fact that there are in India 400,000 jewelers and only 800,000 smiths is eloquent as to one cause of poverty.

Enterprise is as rare as confidence. Opportunities for investment or for improving machinery offer themselves in vain, and little effort is made by activity or by self-restraint to change the conditions endured by previous generations. Born out of due time, the offspring probably of a child-marriage, the man has not the energy even to wish to improve his lot. Oppressed by a system which shuts him up in the limits of his own family, he is unable to strike out a line which leads to distinction; taught that the gods will do what they choose, he resigns himself to fate.

There is a popular tale which is eloquent as to the cause of poverty. God commanded His servants to destroy a certain vessel; when He afterwards blamed them for so doing, they excused themselves, saying, ‘We did as we were commanded.’ One answered, ‘I was wrong,’ and he was justified. Thus does subjection destroy judgment.

The government of such people is, from one point of
view, an easy matter. It is easy to keep order when everyone is docile, it is easy to execute laws when everyone is willing to obey. But the government of such people is, from another point of view, a very difficult matter; it is perhaps more difficult to keep a weak man on his feet than to prevent a strong man from rising. It is difficult to keep those alive who themselves have no great care to live; it is difficult to go on offering opportunities to those who make no effort to seize them; it is difficult to increase comfort among those who give up their living that they may once or twice in their lives enjoy a great show of gilt and light.

If indeed a Government is honestly set on doing its duty, apathy is more troublesome than discontent, and I can imagine Government officials, weary with efforts to stop an approaching famine or to raise the standard of comfort, praying for more discontent, which, if it produced disorder, would also produce effort. What can be more distressing to a magistrate who desires the health of the people than their carelessness about all his measures, and their stolid indifference to his care? It is no wonder that some of these magistrates are 'worn out' by governing the 'most docile people in the world.'

Education which will develop such life-preserving qualities as confidence, enterprise, and prudence can alone secure India from the evils of poverty. Whether the education which is now given is of the right sort remains an open question, but education must always be a slow process, and the end is far distant. The Government has in the meantime to exert itself to provide relief and preserve life. The measures which are passed with this object are innumerable. Critics may say that the Indian Government concerns itself only or chiefly with the 'frontier' question and meditates aggrandisement, but a very short glance at its work is sufficient to show that its chief concern is how to relieve the poverty of the people.

It will be interesting to those in England who have the same concern to learn of something which is being done in India in this direction.

1. From what has been said about the poor it will be under-
stood that 'landlordism' is very often a means of oppression. 'In Behar,' writes the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal in 1878, 'what is most wanted is some ready means of enabling the ryot (tenant) to resist illegal restraint, illegal enhancement, and illegal cesses, and to prove and maintain his occupying right.'

In different parts of India different systems of land tenure exist; in some the tenants hold of absentee landlords as in England and Ireland; in some they hold directly of the Government, the land being practically nationalised; in some they hold of the commune. In every case the Government interferes by laws which aim at giving fixity of tenure and fair rent, and officials are constantly conducting investigations to get at the truth. A complete survey has been made, records from the village heads are accumulated, and all means are available for a just judgment. The investigations are doubtless irritating, and when the loud-voiced landlords, hurt by the limits which are set to their illegal actions, raise complaints, the farmers who hold directly of the Government join in the complaint.

It may be that there is too much investigation, too much Western strictness of interpretation; but I have no doubt that the land system of India would be welcomed by English reformers. How great a relief would it be to the English poor if illegal distrains and illegal enhancement were prevented, how great a relief to the taxpayer if the ground of London were held of the municipality by tenants paying a rent fixed at intervals of thirty years.

In India the attempt to create fixity of tenure and fair rent has not met the success it deserves. Inevitably it rouses the opposition of the richer classes affected, and they are the leaders of opinion. The people have as yet no opinion, they cannot tell when they are benefited, and they still follow old leaders. Practically, too, the cost of carrying out the system has been very great, and has absorbed in salaries money formerly spent on shows. The criticism of the interested and the cost of the first expense ought not to divert attention from
this attempt of the Indian Government to deal with the problem of poverty.

2. Another direction in which the Government has been active is in the promotion of industries. It has been well said that officials in India have ‘not only to rule a great population, but to turn a vast, undeveloped estate to the best account.’ With this view tea-planting was encouraged, railways built, and irrigation extended. The slopes of the Himalayas and the plains of Assam are now dotted with planters’ houses, and thousands of labourers are employed on the tea gardens. The railways now carry millions of passengers through the length and breadth of the land, equalising prices and opening distant markets. The irrigation engineers have literally turned rivers in their courses, and by doing so have secured eight millions of acres from the danger of famine. The simple fact that in a few years the exports of India have been raised from 11,000,000l. to 70,000,000l. is a tribute to the effect of Government measures and Government action on the well-being of the people.

3. Waste lands and congested districts are subjects about which there is much talk at home. In India there are also waste lands, districts in the central provinces and in Assam well fitted for cultivation, and owned by the Government. The congested districts are many, but the way for leaving the districts is made easy. The tenant of the Behar landlord who lives on the brink of starvation may, if he likes, obtain good land in another province, which he may hold on easy terms if he will occupy and work it. There is no need, in ordinary times, for anyone to starve if he will make the effort. The inhabitant of the congested district of East London would welcome a like opportunity.

4. Government has even attempted the difficult task of raising the submerged classes.

In India, as in England, whole families are given up to idleness, and sometimes to vice. In India habit becomes a religion, and these people religiously hold to their idleness. It thus happens that a village or a caste is vicious, and that
its members make no secret of the fact that they live by
theft. In England the vicious and idle are left to be the sport
of charity; in India the Government takes them in hand. Its
policy is, first, to scatter the caste—to send some of its
members to one part of India, some to another. Each
family is then put under the care of the magistrate, who is
authorised to allow them the use of land and cattle, to
receive weekly reports of their progress, and himself to pay
them visits with a view to encouraging them in the love of
labour. The success of the attempt may not be very great,
but it would be hard to say what more could be done.

Government in these and in many other directions aims
at the relief of the poor, but like other socialistic experiments,
its expense becomes oppressive. Clerks, inspectors, experts,
lawyers, and officials of all sorts are necessary. Their
salaries increase by leaps and bounds, and have to be paid by
the people. All that is received from rent is absorbed in
administration, and other taxes become necessary to keep up
the Government of the country. Each poor family pays as
salt-tax every year an amount equal to a week's wages, and
there are local cesses levied for the repair of the roads,
drainage, &c., &c. But the oppression of the Government is
perhaps most felt in its law system, which is kept up at great
expense to decide matters formerly settled at the village
council, and to give permanence to customs which, without its
support, would have become obsolete. The land system would
itself be less unpopular if the law courts were not governed
by technicalities which have developed in Western practice.

Government does much to relieve the people, but the con-
clusion of the whole matter leaves one doubtful if it would
not be more helpful if it did less for them and took less from
them. A system undoubtedly good may be so costly as to be bad;
and the expenditure on returns, surveys, and officials is more
unpopular than the expenditure on pomp's by the Indian rajah.

It seems as if neither the voluntary charity of the family
system nor the socialism of the Government would be effective
to lift from India her burden of poverty. There is much that
is attractive in the family system—there might be more of it in England; there is much that is attractive in socialism—there might be more of it in England. But we leave the consideration of the Indian poor convinced, I think, more than ever, that it is only by education, only by raising the character of the individuals, that the mass can be saved.

JAPAN

'Tell us about the poor,' was the question we asked everywhere in Japan. The professors and the missionaries were most ready with answers. The professors told us of the peculiar circumstances of the country, of the custom or tradition of land tenure which held people to the soil and led every man to make a garden of his holding. There is hardly any pasture land to be seen on the journey across the land from Tokio to Kioto. There has thus been no great exodus from the country to the town, and those countrymen who leave their homes and earn for a time comparatively high wages in town generally return to settle in the country.

The professors told us further that the wants of the people are so few that 6 dols. (24s.) a month is amply sufficient to support a man's life, and that, according to the mediaeval custom, the rich still make friends of their poor neighbours, and do not do good by means of charity societies. At the same time the professors, familiar with European or American conditions, generally agreed that changes were at hand. 'The industrial system,' they said, 'having been introduced, there will be a break up of mediaeval conditions, and the results in Japan will be as the results in England.' Some held that the signs of poverty were increasing—'work in the mills,' they said, 'is so trying that the hands are taking to drink;' and others thought that a country life would cease to afford sufficient attraction to minds made familiar with Western ideas. Generally the professors held that at present there is very little poverty, but that it will certainly come. It was in consequence of this opinion that a very complete Poor Law was introduced into Parliament, but happily did not pass;
and it is in consequence of the same opinion that the students at the universities are interested in methods of relief which are adopted in other countries.

As we listened to the professors we could not help feeling that they talked from theory rather than from knowledge, and that they held 'poverty' to be the necessary equipment of a nation which had adopted Western civilisation. They certainly could speak with no authority about the poor, and could tell of no methods of relief.

We turned, therefore, with our questions to the missionaries. The answer was, 'Come and see'; and we started at once in our 'rickshaws' to ride through the busy gray streets of Tokio. We sped on through street after street, each like to the other, each about ten feet wide and edged with low booth-like shops, and all filled with happy and well-fed people. During the hour it took to drive across the city we saw no one who seemed poor—no beggar, none ill-clad or miserable. It seemed to be a city of tradespeople, where everyone kept a shop to supply his neighbour with necessaries, and where none were too poor and none too rich. At last, having run by the series of glorious temples in which the great Shoguns would have kept alive their memories, we were asked to alight and walk. We turned up an alley, about four feet wide and scrupulously clean. On each side were huts, made of wood, and as the paper fronts were thrown back for the sake of air, it was easy to see all the inside arrangements. There, at the doorway, on a level with the ground and below the floor, was the two-feet space in which all shoes were left. The floor itself, which was not more than twelve feet square, was matted, and was always perfectly clean. In the walls were cupboards in which bedding and utensils were kept, and the only furniture visible was the brazier. The inmates to whom we were introduced always received us courteously and answered our questions. Some seemed ill, but none showed any bitterness or even anxiety. The men, they told us, were employed in sweeping, and their earnings were small. Suddenly we came upon a room occupied by three young men—
graduates of the university—who were engaged with some children. These, we were told, had come down to make friends with the people, to teach the children, and to preach Christianity. One was the son of a rich man, and had no professional vocation, the others were preparing to work as Civil Servants. From these men we learnt that the people were during the winter in want, but their wants were simple and easily supplied by the gift of a small quantity of rice; there was, they said, no attempt at imposition and no begging. They themselves knew whom to help, and their action met the approval of the public. There was no boldly advertised giving and no organisation of those who begged, for there was no need of such things.

We turned away from this poor quarter as from no other all the world round, with feelings almost of happiness. The habits of cleanliness shown by the state of the rooms, the order of the alleys, and the daintiness of the offices, the taste manifest in the restraint which was content with a branch of blossoms, the courtly manners which the poor showed, the patience with which they bore hardship, all combined to make us happy, even in the midst of poverty. In India we had been depressed by the hopelessness, in China by the ugliness, and in America we were to be depressed by the wickedness which accompanies poverty; in Japan we found the poor touched by friendship into hope, and real sharers in the national life.

What is the reason that Japan has no poverty problem? One reason is probably to be found in the land system, which has given to every worker a holding and encouraged him to supply his wants by his own labour. Effort has thus been developed and wants are limited. Another reason lies in the national taste for country beauty. Nowhere else are parties formed to visit the blossom-trees, and nowhere else are pilgrimages made simply for the sake of natural beauty. A country life has, therefore, its own interest, and men do not crowd the cities for the sake of excitement. There is, too, in Japan a curious absence of ostentatious luxury. The habits of living are in all classes much the same, and the rich do
not outshine the poor by carriages, palaces, and jewellery. The rich spend their money on curios, which, if costly, are limited; and the most popular agitation is that against the big European houses which Cabinet ministers are building for themselves. Wealth is thus not absorbed, and is more ready for investment in remunerative labour. The last reason which occurs to the mind of a traveller with comparatively few opportunities for forming opinions is the equality of manners in all classes. Rich and poor are alike courteous. It is not possible to distinguish employer from labourer by their behaviour: all are clean, all are easy, all are restrained. The governor lets his child go to the common school, and sit next to the child of the casual labourer, certain that his child will pick up no bad manners, and get no contamination in thought or in person. This equality enables rich and poor to meet as friends, and gifts to pass without degradation. The rich nobles in the country, just as the university men whom we met in Tokio, are thus able to give to those whom they know to be in need, and friendship becomes the channel of charity. The question is, will these habits, tastes, and manners survive the introduction of the industrial system? It is possible that some may, and that Japan may teach the West how to deal with the poor.

The United States

The United States have their poverty problem. It would be more true to say that each State or each city has its own form of the problem, and any adequate treatment of the subject would involve a knowledge which is rare even among American citizens. There does, however, seem to be a common quality which is everywhere to be found, and passing travellers complain that city is so like to city as to make travelling for the pleasure of change almost superfluous. Those who know may distinguish differences, but all agree that the like is more than the unlike in cities such as San Francisco, Toronto, Chicago, Boston, and New York. It is possible, therefore, to speak of the American poverty problem
as one problem. In each city the same sort of people figure as the poor, and in each the same sort of organisation exists for their relief.

The poor are, (1) a body of tramps, single men, who during the summer travel the country, doing jobs on the farms, and during the winter throng the towns; (2) foreign immigrants; (3) the weak, the thriftless, and the drunken.

The organisation for their relief consists (1) of a poor-house supported by State funds; (2) an organisation of voluntary charities, which has often the appearance of perfection; (3) the gifts of churches and of individuals.

It is safe to say that in no city has relief been fitted to the needs of the poor. In San Francisco, where the smallest coin in circulation is the equivalent of the English threepenny bit, where unskilled labour is paid at the rate of 10s. a day, where it is hard to find any one who will clean a pair of boots, there is in the winter loud demand for relief works as a means of preventing starvation among crowds of men who have no work to do, and relief funds are lavishly distributed. The officer of the Associated Charities confessed that it was impossible to control the impulses of the rich men of this city, and if he complained that gifts did mischief, the answer was, 'What is that to me?'

The rich would not restrain their charity so as to make it effective. City authorities provided no means of training the unskilled even in the prisons, and, according to the report of an active physician, 'the City Hospital is a disgrace to civilisation.' The charity was of the Kodac sort. The rich touched the button and let others do the rest, but in this case the experts are too few.

San Francisco is, in American language, 'the jumping-off place,' the city in which wanderers must live or go under the deep sea. It is, therefore, the city in which poverty must be dealt with—the poor cannot any longer be passed on. The city is the capital of the richest country in the world; its rich men are many, and they give generously. The form of government is so democratic as to leave hardly a grievance
for the most ardent demagogue. But nevertheless the poor increase, and the talk is as the talk of East London, about starvation cases and the inadequacy of the poor-house; the demand is for laws to prevent vagrancy, to reduce rents, and limit immigration.

In Chicago, alongside of the signs of wealth and progress, are also signs of poverty. Warehouses sixteen storeys high, miles of streets, and houses luxuriously appointed, awe the visitor as much as the squalid homes and the dirty quarters of the Italians and Bohemians depress him. How is it that men who in fifty years have created such great wealth fail to deal with poverty? There is the usual poor-house, the usual system of associated or organised charities, the usual benevolent societies, but the poor increase. The poor have their own quarter, and, as in old European cities, are to be found crowded in rooms which look over a four-feet or six-feet alley, and their children play in the streets amid the dirt and garbage. The men, employed as sweepers, often earn 8s. a day, and pay for two rooms 12s. a week. These earnings would perhaps be sufficient if it were not that the houses are unhealthy and the neighbours immoral.

It is hard to imagine the dirt, which having soaked for years into the rotten timbers of which the side walks are constituted, or which, lying in heaps or pools alongside the windows of dwelling-houses, makes the atmosphere heavy. It is even harder to imagine that immorality is allowed to advertise itself, and that houses publicly proclaim their ill-fame. The charity of Chicago takes shape in orphanages, in almshouses, in free gifts, but it leaves strangers to find homes where their health must be shattered and their morals imperilled. There are no playgrounds, no open spaces easily accessible to the poor, few well-built and no well-arranged tenement houses, and, strangest fact of all, the school accommodation is so inadequate that the children who are willing to attend can only do so as half-timers. Chicago complains that its poverty is due to the immigration of foreigners, but it is not hard to see that the conditions of life
contribute to make the weak and the dissolute characters who in all cities become the hopeless poor.

Boston has so great a reputation that the traveller is astonished to hear that one in twenty, or perhaps even one in fifteen, of its population are in receipt of relief. The organisation for relief has all the appearance of perfection. There is a central building where, alongside of the offices of the State charity, are those of private charities. In these offices are kept admirably-arranged records of every applicant, and the very able Superintendent will hand to any inquirer the life history of any one of the poor who has applied to the State charity. 'Do the clergy and philanthropic persons make use of your records?' we asked, and the answer was 'No.' Private charity is, indeed, in Boston as in other places, wayward and wilful; gifts go as passing emotion directs, and institutions are created which represent the fancy rather than the sympathy of the creators. The consequence is that in Boston the poor live as they live in cities less advanced in knowledge: they occupy unhealthy houses, such as would at once be condemned in London on account of want of air and bad sanitary arrangements. The 'model' dwellings are dark and close, the streets are dirty and uncleaned, and the rents are high. It is easy to find neglected families, and, standing in one uneven room, which was darkened by a house a few feet distant, and hearing the tale of poverty from the overburdened mother, I thought myself in the Whitechapel of twenty years ago.

The poor in America live as the poor in England, but there is one marked difference—the poor of America have hope. In the lowest quarters of the great cities, in the most squalid rooms, I was always conscious that the people were looking for better times; they had not the beaten, despairing look of our poor, and they always rose to talk of what their children would be. It is this quality, and not any superiority of relief arrangement, which makes the poverty problem seem less pressing in the States. The relief arrangements are distinctly far behind those of England. There is much less
thoughtful direction of charity, much less of the wise expenditure which prevents poverty, much less of the patient care which encourages effort. The hurry of the Americans makes them give at every call, and when the giving has no result, it makes them turn to prohibition—prohibition of drink, even, it is said, of cigarette-smoking by youths—and most often they are too hurried to make the prohibition effective.

It may seem presumptuous for a passing traveller to offer advice, but the need of the poor in America seems to be better local government, better conditions for health and education. It is because the houses are so bad and the schools so inefficient that tramp life is encouraged; it is because so little is done to educate immigrants that they remain a burden on society. If charity would restrain and strengthen itself it might bring to bear on house-building a knowledge which, at any rate, would not allow offices to be in cellars, and a sympathy which would provide as much open space and as good teaching for the children of the poor as for the children of the rich. The Americans have tried to relieve the poor, but they have let their Government become corrupt, and the penalty is written on the broken lives and bitter passions of the poor. A gift, though it be generous, will not straighten a character which is dwarfed by low surroundings, and a prohibition will not prevent the ignorant from being foolish. The Americans have nothing of which to be proud in their methods of dealing with the poor, they have repeated the mistakes and learnt little from the experience of the old world. But they have a country the richest in the world, they have a national character which has absorbed much that is best in humanity, they receive every year thousands of immigrants who are the most energetic and hopeful of the old world; so that if they will direct their great kindness of heart towards the education of the immigrants and their passionate patriotism towards the ordering of their cities, they may succeed as no other people have succeeded in solving the poverty problem.

Samuel A. Barnett.
THE CHILDREN OF THE GREAT CITY

Six hundred thousand children! all over five—under thirteen. Six hundred thousand! The mind almost staggers under the thought.

Out of these, thirteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-eight were last year sent for a fortnight’s holiday into the country by the Children’s Country Holiday Fund—that is, one out of every forty-three. Can’t you imagine forty-three little faces, some of them happy, rosy, rude; some heavy, dull, flabby-white; some pinched, big-eyed, wistful; some eager, sharp, pushing, ugly; some listless, pale, fragile: all wanting a holiday—all different, only alike in being all young and in each being somebody’s darling. Which one is to be chosen? Only one can go. Yes, it is a big Society, supported by bishops and lords and ladies and great people. It gets lots of money—last year 8,808l. 14s. 11d.—but still only one child out of the forty-three can go. Who shall it be? The happy rosy one who has health enough to enjoy? Can’t you imagine the music of his hearty laugh as he climbs into the hay-cart, or shouts with glee if he is given a ‘leg up’ on to some big farm horse?

No, he can’t be sent; he is well in health and happy enough to find some fun in the street gutter, and if his holidays do leave him less rosy and more rude, well, it can’t be helped. By refusing him we are only denying him healthy pleasure. No, he must not be the one sent.

Shall we send this stodgey girl? She is so dull; nothing seems to rouse her. Yes, her people are decent people. They

1 Reprinted from Atalanta, April 1888.
sleep eight in one room, and the window is rarely open; but they struggle to be respectable, and keep the children indoors away from the harm of the streets. Perhaps the country sights and open-air games will rouse her. Just fancy, if Martha came back brightened! Why, she would soon get on through school and into service, for she is regular and a painstaking child, only so heavy; she doesn’t seem to care for anything. Yes, Martha shall go. No! children, only one of you, and it had better be Martha.

Oh! but Freddy is so pale. The father had an accident in the autumn: he was a carter, and slipped and fell, and the wheel went over him, and things have been bad with them this winter. Freddy used to look first-rate. Nanny died at Christmas, dear little soul! but one can’t be sorry. She was only seven, and quite ready for the second standard; but when the frost came she got ’clemmed,’ as they say in the north, and soon dropped off. Her mother cries still about it, but when ‘he was out of work’ she could not feed them all—and Freddy gets none too much now. Two or three weeks’ country holiday would do him good, fatten him up a bit, and give him something to think of besides the winter’s troubles. Poor little man! ’Tis hard to have so much sorrow before you are eleven. Shall we settle it, then, and send Freddy?

If only Julia could go too! That girl’s character is getting ruined. She is always taking, pushing, struggling, reaching, and all because she never has anything given to her. If she could have just two weeks of real good time with some motherly, big-hearted woman, who would give the child pleasures, not wait till she took them. Imagine what it might do for her if she got apples without bargaining for them, or something nice without pushing a little one aside to get it; and what a difference it might make if she found that God had made the sea big enough for all to paddle in!

Yes! character is more important than health. Freddy is so good, he is only weakly; but to make Julia nicer—more unselfish—that is better worth doing.

It is difficult to choose. Can’t they both go? No; only
one out of the forty-three. Then it shall be Julia. Yet, little one, perhaps it ought to be you! Poor little frail pet! Come and sit on my knee. Twelve years old you say you are? No, mother must have made a mistake; you don't look more than nine, and that spelling book tells your standard, doesn't it? Yes, I remember all about the long illness, and how mother had to go out to work and leave you sick, and now you are weak and always tired. Poor little maid! Yes, it is hot in the alley, and noisy and stuffy too. What would you do in the country? Why, sit in the garden and listen to the birds, and rest for a few days till you felt inclined to run about; or perhaps the baker would give you rides in his cart, and the ladies would send you milk, and come and talk gently to you; but soon you would feel better and go and play with the other children, and pick the flowers, and toss the hay, and have such games with the sheep-dog, and run—perhaps even win—a race, if the country lady gave a party. Does mother work all day? Really! From before you are up till seven at night? But things were better, when father was alive, you say? True: but they never will be again, little one. Widows' lives don't get easier as they get older, and she is behind with the rent, too, again. It is difficult to choose, but the people who give the money want the ailing children to go, anyway first. We must do what they wish who give the money, so that helps to settle it, and Lizzie shall go. Now be off, children. Yes, go, you rogue! Space would drive all devil out of your fun; and you, my bright tom-boy girl, always in scrapes here in the one-roomed home; and pert Sally! would the almighty sea teach you humility? And lame Dick—ah! little lad, the country would give you some memories; and you, too, commonplace Jane, the sight of the star-lit heavens across a common might perhaps do you good; and music-loving Bob! how you would love the babble of the brooks and the chorus of the waves—if you could only all go! No, Freddy, 'tis only for one of you, and Lizzie is not so well as you, is she? You must give up. Ay! that lesson will be silently but effectively taught him, poor little lad, as he drags
through life, stunted in body power and brain from want—want in all its forms—in his childhood.

The Children's Country Holiday Fund extends all over London. It has over thirty local committees, who, having accepted an area approved by the Central Council, leave all the drier business details to that body, and devote themselves to the many arrangements which are entailed in sending the little visitors to their country hosts—arrangements which include collection of the parents' money, correspondence with the country homes, choice of trains and days for travelling, careful planning about sexes and ages, as well as negotiations with the doctor for a clean bill of health; and sometimes confidential talks with careful mothers who fear damage to long-treasured clothes, or whose honest pride resents their children leaving home with 'nothing to wear.'

The children once off, each with a label tied round the neck, the work of the town committee member is over and the work of the country member begins. To her falls the duty of choosing the homes, and seeing that the hostesses are not only respectable but kindly, motherly, and judicious women; investigating the sleeping accommodation, arranging the thousand and one difficulties, from 'How shall I get him from the station, ma'am?' to 'My hens are mostly sitting now or out with broods, and if she be weakly she'll want more milk than I can manage for.' To such details the country lady often adds the duty of making pleasure for the children—country rambles, tea-parties, swings, see-saws, drives in carts or carriages, expeditions to local places of interest, picnic-meals—all need planning, but help to make the fortnight in the country a never-to-be-forgotten epoch in the young life. 'No fear we shall forget he's been,' said one woman, 'why he tells us every day something about it.' 'Another fortnight and I shouldn't have known my own child,' was the gratifying comment of a grateful mother; and indeed many a pale, wan, listless little face comes back plump and sunburnt, with its owner all too eager to tell of country wonders. 'Do the beasts really do all she tells of?' asked one true cockney
parent in whose young days the Children's Country Holiday Fund had no existence; while the declaration that 'the sea went up and down,' given as an explanation of the tidal system by one little mortal who had been so happy as to be sent to the seaside, proved too much for his mother, who 'wasn't going to be took in, though he do seem to have learned such a sight while he's been away.' And learn the children do during their short holidays—not only facts about beasts and birds and flowers and sky and sea, but

Perchance some serious childish eyes
Uplifted to the sunset skies,
Read there a strange new story,
And dimly see the Love that holds
The round world safe, and o'er it folds
The mantle of His glory.

They learn, too, some of the sweeter, purer ways of the simpler countryfolk, and something—often the first lesson—of the meaning of friendship. Again and again have the country hosts kept their guests for 'a bit longer' without pay, and then packed them off 'home to mother' with queer-shaped packets full of 'country stuff,' which sometimes includes a bottle of milk straight from the cow. 'At home I gets milk from a nice clean shop, but there they squeezed it out of a nasty cow! I see'd him do it—but I wouldn't take none,' grumbled one young victim, whose experience of natural facts was limited; but grumbles are few, and the delight and general good-feeling of children, parents, and country hosts is one of the pleasures of both the town and country 'holiday ladies' on whom the work falls.

To get the young of our vast cities interested in country life is no slight good now, when migration or emigration seem the only solution to the great problem of city over-population, and these holidays, short as they are, certainly do something in that direction. 'Good-bye, uncle, I'll hope to come again.' 'Maybe I shall live here when I've grown up,' confided an eight-year-old pickle to his cottage hostess; and 'May I go where I did once before?' is sometimes asked by some
grubby little-being who has time-fed memories of the glories of a previous visit to a place that would be called by most of us 'dull and uninteresting.' The answer is in the hands of those who have money, or could have money by the sacrifice of some personal pleasure or household luxury. May the small half-fed mite go again? May more than one out of forty-three be chosen

To find in bird and flower and tree
Gleams of the beautiful mystery
That binds the world together?

Henrietta O. Barnett.

P.S.—Last year, 1898, nearly 30,000 children were sent for a fortnight's holiday into the country from London alone, while many provincial towns have started C.H.F. committees, and are working on the same lines.
RELIEF FUNDS AND THE POOR

The poverty of the poor and the failure of the Mansion House Relief Fund are the facts which stand out from the gloom of a winter when dark weather, dull times, and discontent united to depress both the hopes of the poor and the energy of their friends. The memory of days full of unavailing complaint and of aimless pity is one from which all minds readily turn, quieting fears with the assumption that the poverty is always exaggerated, or that the generosity of the rich is ample for all occasions.

The facts, however, remain, that the poor are very poor, and that the fund failed as a means of relief; and these facts must be faced if a lesson is to be learnt from the past, and a way discovered through the perils of the future. The policies which occupy the leaders' minds, the interests of business, the theologies, the fashions, are but webs woven in the trees while the storm is rising in the distance. Sounds of the storm are already in the air, a murmuring among those who have not enough, puffs of boasting from those who have too much, and a muttering from those who are angry because while some are drunken others are starving. The social question is rising for solution, and, though for a moment it is forgotten, it will sweep to the front and put aside as cobwebs the 'deep' concerns of leaders and teachers. The danger is lest it be settled by passion and not by reason, lest, that is, reforms be hurriedly undertaken in answer to some cry, and

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Nineteenth Century of November 1886.
without consideration of facts, their weight, their causes, and their relation.

The study of the condition of the people receives hardly as much attention as that which Sir J. Lubbock gives to the ants and the wasps. Bold good men discuss the poor, and cheques are given by irresponsible benefactors; but there are few students who reverently and patiently make observations on social conditions, accumulate facts, and watch cause and effect. Scientific method has won the great victories of the day, and scientific method is supreme everywhere except in those human affairs which most concern humanity.

Ten years ago Arnold Toynbee demanded a 'body of doctrine' from those who cared for the poor. He sought an intellectual basis for moral fervour, and yet to-day what a muck-heap is our social legislation, what a confusion of opinion there exists about the poor law, education, emigration, and land laws! All reformers are driving on; but what is each driving at? Sometimes the same driver has aims obviously incompatible, as when the Lord Mayor one day signs a report which says that 'the spasmodic assistance given by the public in answer to special appeals is really useless,' and another day himself inaugurates a relief fund by a special appeal.

One of the facts made evident last winter is the poverty of the poor, and it is a fact about which the public mind is uncertain.

The working men when they appear at meetings seem to be well dressed in black cloth, the statistics of trades-unions, friendly, co-operative, and building societies show the members to be so numerous, and the accumulated funds to be so far above thousands and so near to millions sterling, that the necessary conclusion is, 'There is no poverty among the poor.' But then the clergy or missionaries echo some 'bitter cry,' and tell how there are thousands of working folk in danger of starvation, thousands without warmth or clothing, and the necessary conclusion is, 'All the poor are poverty-stricken.' The public mind halts between these two conclusions and is uncertain.
The uncertainty is due partly to the vague use of the term 'poor,' by which is generally meant all those who are not tradespeople or capitalists, and partly to an inability to appreciate the size of London. The poor, it is obvious, form only a minority in the community, and a minority suggests something unimportant, and notwithstanding the size of London, it is regarded as a small and manageable body.

Last winter's experience clears away all uncertainty, and shows that there is a vast mass of people in London who have neither black coats nor savings, and whose life is dwarfed and shortened by want of food and clothing. In Whitechapel there is a population of 70,000: of these some 20 per cent., exclusive of the Jewish population, applied at the office of the Mansion House Relief Fund during the three months it was opened. In St. George's East there is a population of 50,000, and of these 29 per cent. applied. Among all who applied the number belonging to any trades-union or friendly society was very few. In Whitechapel only six out of 1,700 applicants were members of a benefit club. In St. George's only 177 out of 3,578 called themselves artisans. In Stepney 1,000 men applied before one mechanic came, and only one member of a trades-union came under notice at all. In the Tower Hamlets division of East London, out of a population of 500,000, 17,384 applied, representing 86,920 persons. It may be safely assumed that all in need did not apply, and that many thousands were assisted by other agencies. The reports of some of the visitors expressly state that the numbers they give are exclusive of many referred to the Jewish Board of Guardians, the clergy, and other agencies, while many of those who did apply either did not wait to have their names entered, or were so manifestly beyond the reach of money help that they were not recorded among applicants. Especially noteworthy among the remarks of the visitors is one, that all who applied would at any season of the year apply in the same way and give the same evidence of poverty. 'If a fund was advertised as largely as this fund has been in summer, and when trade was at its best, pre-
cisely the same people would apply.' The truth of the remark has been put to the test, and during the summer a large number of those relieved in the winter have been visited, with the result that they have been found apparently in like misery and equally in need of assistance.

Of the poverty of those who made application there has been no question. Some may have brought it on themselves by drink or by vice, some may have been thriftless and without self-control; but all were poor, so poor as to be without the things necessary for mere existence. The men and women who crowded the relief offices had haggard and drawn faces, their worn and thin bodies shivered under their rags of clothing, and they gave no sign of strength or of hope. Their homes were squalid, the children ill-fed, ill-clad, and joyless; their record showed that for months they had received no regular wage, and that their substance was more often at the pawnbroker's than in the home.

Last winter's experience shows that outside the classes of regular wage-earning workmen, who are often included among 'the poor,' is a mass of people numbering some tens of thousands who are without the means of living. These are the poor, and their poverty is the common concern.

Statistics prove what has long been known to those whose business lies in poor places, and to them the reports of the increased prosperity of the country have been like songs of gladness in a land of sorrow. They know the streets in which every room is a home, the homes in which there is no comfort for the sick, no easy-chair for the weary, no bath for the tired, no fresh air, no means of keeping food, no space for play, no possibility of quiet, and to them the news of the national wealth and the sight of fashionable luxury seem but cruel satire. The little dark rooms may bear traces of the man's struggle or of the woman's patience, but the homes of the poor are sad, like the fields of lost battles, where heroism has fought in vain. By no struggle and by no patience can health be won in so few feet of cubic air, and no parent dares to hope that he can make the time of youth so joyful as to for ever hold his children to pleasures which are pure.
Six hundred thousand children! all over five—under thirteen. Six hundred thousand! The mind almost staggers under the thought.

Out of these, thirteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-eight were last year sent for a fortnight's holiday into the country by the Children's Country Holiday Fund—that is, one out of every forty-three. Can't you imagine forty-three little faces, some of them happy, rosy, rude; some heavy, dull, flabby-white; some pinched, big-eyed, wistful; some eager, sharp, pushing, ugly; some listless, pale, fragile: all wanting a holiday—all different, only alike in being all young and in each being somebody's darling. Which one is to be chosen? Only one can go. Yes, it is a big Society, supported by bishops and lords and ladies and great people. It gets lots of money—last year 8,808l. 14s. 11d.—but still only one child out of the forty-three can go. Who shall it be? The happy rosy one who has health enough to enjoy? Can't you imagine the music of his hearty laugh as he climbs into the hay-cart, or shouts with glee if he is given a 'leg up' on to some big farm horse?

No, he can't be sent; he is well in health and happy enough to find some fun in the street gutter, and if his holidays do leave him less rosy and more rude, well, it can't be helped. By refusing him we are only denying him healthy pleasure. No, he must not be the one sent.

Shall we send this stodgy girl? She is so dull; nothing seems to rouse her. Yes, her people are decent people. They

---

1 Reprinted from Atalanta, April 1888.
THE CHILDREN OF THE GREAT CITY

sleep eight in one room, and the window is rarely open; but they struggle to be respectable, and keep the children indoors away from the harm of the streets. Perhaps the country sights and open-air games will rouse her. Just fancy, if Martha came back brightened! Why, she would soon get on through school and into service, for she is regular and a pains-taking child, only so heavy; she doesn’t seem to care for anything. Yes, Martha shall go. No! children, only one of you, and it had better be Martha.

Oh! but Freddy is so pale. The father had an accident in the autumn: he was a carter, and slipped and fell, and the wheel went over him, and things have been bad with them this winter. Freddy used to look first-rate. Nanny died at Christmas, dear little soul! but one can’t be sorry. She was only seven, and quite ready for the second standard; but when the frost came she got ‘clammed,’ as they say in the north, and soon dropped off. Her mother cries still about it, but when ‘he was out of work’ she could not feed them all—and Freddy gets none too much now. Two or three weeks’ country holiday would do him good, fatten him up a bit, and give him something to think of besides the winter’s troubles. Poor little man! ’Tis hard to have so much sorrow before you are eleven. Shall we settle it, then, and send Freddy?

If only Julia could go to! That girl’s character is getting ruined. She is always taking, pushing, struggling, reaching, and all because she never has anything given to her. If she could have just two weeks of real good time with some motherly, big-hearted woman, who would give the child pleasures, not wait till she took them. Imagine what it might do for her if she got apples without bargaining for them, or something nice without pushing a little one aside to get it; and what a difference it might make if she found that God had made the sea big enough for all to paddle in!

Yes! character is more important than health. Freddy is so good, he is only weakly; but to make Julia nicer—more unselfish—that is better worth doing.

It is difficult to choose. Can’t they both go? No; only
one out of the forty-three. Then it shall be Julia. Yet, little one, perhaps it ought to be you! Poor little frail pet! Come and sit on my knee. Twelve years old you say you are? No, mother must have made a mistake; you don't look more than nine, and that spelling book tells your standard, doesn't it? Yes, I remember all about the long illness, and how mother had to go out to work and leave you sick, and now you are weak and always tired. Poor little maid! Yes, it is hot in the alley, and noisy and stuffy too. What would you do in the country? Why, sit in the garden and listen to the birds, and rest for a few days till you felt inclined to run about; or perhaps the baker would give you rides in his cart, and the ladies would send you milk, and come and talk gently to you; but soon you would feel better and go and play with the other children, and pick the flowers, and toss the hay, and have such games with the sheep-dog, and run—perhaps even win—a race, if the country lady gave a party. Does mother work all day? Really! From before you are up till seven at night? But things were better, when father was alive, you say? True: but they never will be again, little one. Widows' lives don't get easier as they get older, and she is behind with the rent, too, again. It is difficult to choose, but the people who give the money want the ailing children to go, anyway first. We must do what they wish who give the money, so that helps to settle it, and Lizzie shall go. Now be off, children. Yes, go, you rogue! Space would drive all devil out of your fun; and you, my bright tom-boy girl, always in scrapes here in the one-roomed home; and pert Sally! would the almighty sea teach you humility? And lame Dick—ah! little lad, the country would give you some memories; and you, too, commonplace Jane, the sight of the star-lit heavens across a common might perhaps do you good; and music-loving Bob! how you would love the babble of the brooks and the chorus of the waves—if you could only all go! No, Freddy, 'tis only for one of you, and Lizzie is not so well as you, is she? You must give up. Ay! that lesson will be silently but effectively taught him, poor little lad, as he drags
through life, stunted in body power and brain from want—want in all its forms—in his childhood.

The Children's Country Holiday Fund extends all over London. It has over thirty local committees, who, having accepted an area approved by the Central Council, leave all the drier business details to that body, and devote themselves to the many arrangements which are entailed in sending the little visitors to their country hosts—arrangements which include collection of the parents' money, correspondence with the country homes, choice of trains and days for travelling, careful planning about sexes and ages, as well as negotiations with the doctor for a clean bill of health; and sometimes confidential talks with careful mothers who fear damage to long-treasured clothes, or whose honest pride resents their children leaving home with 'nothing to wear.'

The children once off, each with a label tied round the neck, the work of the town committee member is over and the work of the country member begins. To her falls the duty of choosing the homes, and seeing that the hostesses are not only respectable but kindly, motherly, and judicious women; investigating the sleeping accommodation, arranging the thousand and one difficulties, from 'How shall I get him from the station, ma'am?' to 'My hens are mostly sitting now or out with broods, and if she be weakly she'll want more milk than I can manage for.' To such details the country lady often adds the duty of making pleasure for the children—country rambles, tea-parties, swings, see-saws, drives in carts or carriages, expeditions to local places of interest, picnic-meals—all need planning, but help to make the fortnight in the country a never-to-be-forgotten epoch in the young life. 'No fear we shall forget he's been,' said one woman, 'why he tells us every day something about it.' 'Another fortnight and I shouldn't have known my own child,' was the gratifying comment of a grateful mother; and indeed many a pale, wan, listless little face comes back plump and sunburnt, with its owner all too eager to tell of country wonders. 'Do the beasts really do all she tells of?' asked one true cockney
parent in whose young days the Children's Country Holiday Fund had no existence; while the declaration that 'the sea went up and down,' given as an explanation of the tidal system by one little mortal who had been so happy as to be sent to the seaside, proved too much for his mother, who 'wasn't going to be took in, though he do seem to have learned such a sight while he's been away.' And learn the children do during their short holidays—not only facts about beasts and birds and flowers and sky and sea, but

Perchance some serious childish eyes
Uplifted to the sunset skies,
Read there a strange new story,
And dimly see the Love that holds
The round world safe, and o'er it folds
The mantle of His glory.

They learn, too, some of the sweeter, purer ways of the simpler countryfolk, and something—often the first lesson—of the meaning of friendship. Again and again have the country hosts kept their guests for 'a bit longer' without pay, and then packed them off 'home to mother' with queer-shaped packets full of 'country stuff,' which sometimes includes a bottle of milk straight from the cow. 'At home I gets milk from a nice clean shop, but there they squeezed it out of a nasty cow! I see'd him do it—but I wouldn't take none,' grumbled one young victim, whose experience of natural facts was limited; but grumbles are few, and the delight and general good-feeling of children, parents, and country hosts is one of the pleasures of both the town and country 'holiday ladies' on whom the work falls.

To get the young of our vast cities interested in country life is no slight good now, when migration or emigration seem the only solution to the great problem of city over-population, and these holidays, short as they are, certainly do something in that direction. 'Good-bye, uncle, I'll hope to come again.' 'Maybe I shall live here when I've grown up,' confided an eight-year-old pickle to his cottage hostess; and 'May I go where I did once before?' is sometimes asked by some
grubby little being who has time-fed memories of the glories of a previous visit to a place that would be called by most of us 'dull and uninteresting.' The answer is in the hands of those who have money, or could have money by the sacrifice of some personal pleasure or household luxury. May the small half-fed mite go again? May more than one out of forty-three be chosen

To find in bird and flower and tree
Gleams of the beautiful mystery
That binds the world together?

HENRIETTA O. BARNETT.

P.S.—Last year, 1898, nearly 30,000 children were sent for a fortnight's holiday into the country from London alone, while many provincial towns have started C.H.F. committees, and are working on the same lines.
gifts fell on the worthy and on the unworthy, but as they fell only in partial showers none received enough, and many who were worthy went empty away.

Discrimination of desert is indeed impossible. The Poor Law officials, with ample time and long experience, cannot say who deserves or would be benefited by out-relief. Amateurs appointed in a hurry, and confused by numbers, vainly try to settle desert. Systems must adopt rules; friendship alone can settle merit.

The fund failed to relieve distress, and further developed some of the causes which make poverty.

Prominent among such causes are (1) faith in chance; (2) dishonesty in its fullest sense; (8) mischievous charity.

(1) The big advertisement of '70,000l. to be given away' offered a chance which attracted idlers, and relaxed in many workers the energies hitherto so patiently braced to win a living for wife or children. The effect is frequently noticed in the reports. The St. George's-in-the-East visitors emphasise the opinion that it was 'the great publicity of the fund which made its distribution so difficult.' A visitor in Poplar thinks 'the publicity was tempting to bad cases and deterrent of good ones.' The chance of a gift out of so big a sum was too good to be missed for the sake of hard work and small wages.

Faith in chance was further encouraged by the irregular methods of administration. Refusals and relief followed no law discoverable by the poor. In the same street one washerwoman was set up with a stock, while another in equal circumstances was dismissed. In adjoining districts various systems were adopted that of three 'mates' one would receive work, another a gift, and the third nothing. 'The power of chance' was the teaching of the fund, started through the accidental emotions of a Lord Mayor, and they who believe in chance give up effort, become wayward, and lose power of mind and body. Chance leads her followers to poverty, and the increase of the spirit of gambling is not the least among the causes of distress.

(2) The remark is sometimes made that 'the righteous
man is never found begging his bread,' or, in other words, that there is always work for the man who can be trusted. Honesty in its fullest sense, implying absolute truth, thoroughness, and responsibility, has great value in the labour market, and agencies which increase a trust in honesty increase wealth. The tendency of the fund has been to create a trust in lies. Its organisation of visitors and committees offered a show of resistance to lies, but over such resistance lies easily triumphed, and many notorious evil-livers won by a good story the relief denied to others. Anecdotes are common as to the way in which visitors were deceived, committees hoodwinked, and money wrongly gained, while the better sort of poor, failing to understand how so much money could have had so little effect, hold the officials to have been smart fellows who took care of themselves. The laughter roused by such talk is the laughter which demoralises, it is the praise of the power of lies, and the laughers will not be among those who by honesty do well for themselves and for others.

(8) The mischief of foolish charity is a text on which much has been written, but no doubt exists as to the power of wise charity. The teaching which fits the young to do better work or to find resource in a bye-trade, the influence by which the weak are strengthened to resist temptation, the application of principles which will give confidence, and the setting up of ideals which will enlarge the limits of life—this is the charity which conquers poverty. In East London there are many engaged in such charity, and to their work the action of the fund was most prejudicial. Some of them, carried away by the excitement, relaxed their patient, silent efforts while they tried to meet a thousand needs with no other remedy than a gift. Others saw their work spoiled, their lessons of self-help undone by the offer of a dole, their teaching of the duty of helping others forgotten in the greedy scramble for graceless gifts. They devoted themselves to do their utmost and bore the heavy burden of distributing the fund, but most of them speak sadly of their experience.
They laboured sometimes for sixteen hours a day, but their labour was not to do good but to prevent evil—a labour of pain—and one, speaking the experience of his fellows, says ‘their labours had the appearance of a hurried and spasmodic effort.’ The fund of charity, like a torrent, swept away the tender plants which the stream of charity had nourished.

In the face of all this experience it is not extravagant to say that the means of relief used last winter developed the causes of poverty. It may be that if all the poor were self-controlled and honest, and if all charity were wise, poverty would still exist; but self-indulgence, lies, and unwise charity are causes of poverty, and these causes have been strengthened. One visitor’s report sums up the whole matter when it says:—

‘They (the applicants) have received their relief, and they are now in much the same position as they were before, and as they will be found, it is feared, in future winters until more effectual and less spasmodic means of improving their condition can be devised, for the causes of distress are chronic and permanent. The foundation of such independence of character as they possessed has been shaken, and some of them have taken the first step in mendicancy, which is too often never retraced.’

Examples, of course, may be found where the relief has been helpful, and some visitors, in the contemplation of the worthy family relieved from pressure and set free to work, may think that one such result justifies many failures. It is not, though, expedient that many should suffer for one, or that a population should be demoralised in order that two or three might have enough.

The fund as a means of relief has failed: it is condemned by the recipients, who are bitter on account of disappointed hopes; by the almoners, whose only satisfaction is that they managed to do the least possible mischief; and by the artisans, whose name was taken in vain by the agitators who went to the Lord Mayor, and who feel their class degraded by a
system of relief which assumes improvidence and imposition among working men.

The failure of the latest method of relief has been made as manifest as the poverty, and no prophet is needed to tell that bad times are coming. The outlook is most gloomy. The August reports of trades societies characterise trade as 'dull' or 'very slack.' The pawnbrokers report in the same month that they are taking in rather than handing out pledges, and all those who have experience of the poor consider poverty to be chronic. If not in the coming winter, still in the near future there must be trouble.

Poverty in London is increasing both relatively and actually. Relative poverty may be lightly considered, but it breeds trouble as rapidly as actual poverty. The family which has an income sufficient to support life on oatmeal will not grow in good-will when they know that daily meat and holidays are spoken of as 'necessaries' for other workers and children. Education and the spread of literature have raised the standard of living, and they who cannot provide boots for their children, nor sufficient fresh air, nor clean clothes, nor means of pleasure, feel themselves to be poor, and have the hopelessness which is the curse of poverty as selfishness is the curse of wealth.

Poverty, however, in East London is increasing actually. It is increased (1) by the number of incapables: 'broken men, who by their misfortunes or their vices have fallen out of regular work,' and who are drawn to East London because chance work is more plentiful, 'company' more possible, and life more enlivened by excitement. (2) By the deterioration of the physique of those born in close rooms, brought up in narrow streets, and early made familiar with vice. It was noticed that among the crowds who applied for relief there were few who seemed healthy or were strongly grown. In Whitechapel the foreman of those employed in the streets reported that 'the majority had not the stamina to make even a good scavenger.' (3) By the disrepute into which saving is fallen. Partly because happiness (as the majority count
happiness) seems to be beyond their reach, partly because the teaching of the example of the well-to-do is 'enjoy yourselves,' and partly because 'the saving man' seems 'bad company, unsocial and selfish'; the fact remains that few take the trouble to save—only units out of the thousands of applicants had shown any signs of thrift. (4) By the growing animosity of the poor against the rich. Good-will among men is a source of prosperity as well as of peace. Those who are thus bound together consider one another's interests, and put the good of the 'whole' before the good of a class. Among large classes of the poor animosity is slowly taking the place of good-will, the rich are held to be of another nation, the theft of a lady's diamonds is not always condemned as the theft of a poor man's money, and the gift of $70,000 is looked on as ransom, and perhaps an inadequate ransom. The bitter remarks sometimes heard by the almoners are signs of disunion, which will decrease the resources of all classes. The fault did not begin with the poor; the rich sin, but the poor, made poorer and more angry, suffer the most.

On account of these and other causes it may be expected that poverty will be increased. The poorer quarters will become still poorer, the sight of squalor, misery, and hunger more painful, the cry of the poor more bitter. For their relief no adequate means are proposed. The last twenty years have been years of progress, but for lack of care and thought the means of relief for poverty remain unchanged. The only resource twenty years ago was a Mansion House Fund, and the only resource available in this enlightened and wealthy year of our Lord is a similar gift thrown—not brought—from the West to the East.

The paradise in which a few theorists lived, listening to the talk at Social Science Congresses, has been rudely broken. Lord Mayors, merchant princes, prime ministers, and able editors have no better means for relief of distress than that long ago discredited by failure. One of the greatest dangers possible to the State has been growing in their midst, and the leaders have slumbered and slept. The resources of civilisation, which are
said to be ample to suppress disorder and to evolve new policies, have not provided means by which the chief commandment may be obeyed, and love shown to the poor neighbour.

The outlook is gloomy enough, and the cure of the evil is not to be effected by a simple prescription. The cure must be worked by slow means which will take account of the whole nature of man, which will consider the future to be as important as the present, and which will win by waiting.

Generally it is assumed that the chief change is that to be effected in the habits of the poor. All sorts of missions and schemes exist for the working of this change. Perhaps it is more to the purpose that a change should be effected in the habits of the rich. Society has settled itself on a system which it never questions, and it is assumed to be absolutely within a man's right to live where he chooses and to get the most for his money.

It is this practice of living in pleasant places which impoverishes the poor. It authorises, as it were, a lower standard of life for the neighbourhoods in which the poor are left; it encourages a contempt for a home which is narrow; it leaves large quarters of the town without the light which comes from knowledge, and large masses of the people without the friendship of those better taught than themselves. The precept that 'everyone should live over his shop' has a very direct bearing on life, and it is the absence of so many from their shops, be the shop 'the land' or 'a factory,' which makes so many others poorer.

Absenteism is an acknowledged cause of Irish troubles, and Mr. Goldwin Smith has pointed out that 'the greatest evils of absenteeism are—first, that it withdraws from the community the upper class, who are the natural channels of civilising influences to the classes below them; and secondly, that it cuts off all personal relations between the individual landlord and his tenant.' He further adds that it was 'natural the gentry should avoid the sight of so much wretchedness . . . and be drawn to the pleasures of London or Dublin.'
The result in Ireland was heartbreaking poverty which relief funds did not relieve, and there is no reason why in East London absenteeism should have other results.

In the same way the unquestioned habit by which everyone thinks himself justified in getting the most for his money tends to make poverty. In the competition which the habit provokes many are trampled underfoot, and in the search after enjoyment wealth is wasted which would support thousands in comfort.

The habits of the people are in the charge of the Church, so that by its ministers (conformist and non-conformist) God’s Spirit may bend the most stubborn will. Those ministers have a great responsibility. God’s Spirit has been imprisoned in phrases about the duty of contentment and the sin of drink; the stubborn will has been strengthened by the doctor’s opinion as to the necessity of living apart from the worry of work, and by the teaching of a political economy which assumes that a man’s might is a man’s right. The ministers who would change the habits of the rich will have to preach the prophet’s message about the duty of giving and the sin of luxury, and to denounce ways of business now pronounced to be respectable and Christian. Old teaching will have to be put in new language, giving shown to consist in sharing, and earning to be a form of sacrifice. For some time it may be the glory of a preacher to empty rather than to fill his church as he reasons about the Judgment to come, when ‘twopence a gross to the matchmakers will be laid alongside of the twenty-two per cent. to the shareholders,’ and penny dinners for the poor compared with the sixteen courses for the rich—when the ‘seamy’ side of wealth and pleasures will be exposed.¹ For some time the ministers who would change men’s habits may fail to attract congregations. It is not until they are able again to lift up the God whose presence is dimly felt, and

¹ Prices paid according to the Mansion House report are: Making of shirts, 3d. each; making soldiers’ leggings, 2s. a dozen; making lawn-tennis aprons, elaborately frilled, 5½d. a dozen to the sweater, the actual worker getting less.
whose nature is misunderstood, that they will succeed. In the knowledge of God is eternal life. When all know God as the Father who requires rich and poor to be perfect sharers in His gifts of virtue, forgiveness, and peace, then none will be satisfied until they are at one with Him, and His habit has become their habit.

It may, however, be well here to suggest in a few words what may be done while habits remain the same by laws or systems for the relief of poverty.

It would be wise (1) to promote the organisation of unskilled labour. The mass of applicants last winter belonged to this class, and in one report it is distinctly said that the greater number were ‘born within the demoralising influence of the intermittent and irregular employment given by the Dock Companies, and who have never been able to rise above their circumstances.’ It is in evidence that the wages of these men do not exceed 12s. a week on an average in a year. If, by some encouragement, these men could be induced to form a union, and if by some pressure the Docks could be induced to employ a regular gang, much would be gained. The very organisation would be a lesson to these men in self-restraint and in fellowship. The substitution of regular hands at the Docks for those who now, by waiting and scrambling, get a daily ticket would give to a large number of men the help of settled employment and take away the dependence on chance which makes many careless. Such a change might be met by a non possumus of the directors, but it is forgotten that to the present system a weightier non possumus would be urged if the labourers could speak as shareholders now speak. A possible loss of profit is not comparable to an actual loss of life, and the labourers do lose life and more than life that the dividend or salaries may be increased.

(2) The helpers of the poor might be efficiently organised. The ideal of co-operating charity has long hovered over the mischief and waste of competing charity. Up to the present denominational jealousy, or the belief in crotchetts, or the self-will which ‘dislikes committees’ has prevented common work.
If all who are serving the poor could meet and divide—meet to learn one another's object and divide each to do his own work—there would be a force applied which might remove mountains of difficulty. Abuse would be known, wise remedies would be suggested, and foolish remedies prevented. Indirect means would be brought to the support of direct, and those concerned to reform the land laws, to teach the ignorant, and beautify the ugly would be recognised as fellow-workers with those whose object is the abolition of poverty. Money would be amply given, and the high motives of faith and love would be applied to the reform of character.

The ideal is in its fulness impossible until there be a really national Church, in which the denominations will each preach their truth, and in which 'the entire religious life of the nation will be expressed.' Such a church, extending into every corner of the land, and drawing to itself all who love their neighbours, would realise the ideal of co-operative charity, and so order things that no one would be in sorrow whom comfort will relieve, and no one in pain whom help can succour.

(8) Lastly, the qualification for a seat on a Board of Guardians might be removed and the position opened to working men.¹ The action of the Poor Law has a very distinct effect on poverty, and intelligent experience is on the side of administration by rule rather than by sentiment. In Poor Law unions, where it is known that 'indoors' all that is necessary for life will be provided, but that 'outdoors' nothing will be given, the poor feel that they are under a rule which they can understand. They are able to calculate on what will happen in a way which is impossible when 'giving goes by favour or desert,' and they do not wait and suffer by trusting to a chance. Public opinion, however, does not support such administration, and as public opinion is largely now that of the working men, it is necessary that these men should be admitted on to Boards

¹ It might be necessary at the same time to abolish 'the compounding', so that the tenant of every tenement might himself pay the rates and feel their burden.
of Guardians, where by experience they would learn how impossible it is to adjust relief to desert, and how much less cruel is regular sternness than spasmodic kindness. A carefully and wisely administered Poor Law is the best weapon in hand for the troubles to come, and such is impossible without the sympathy of all classes.

By some such means preparation may be made for dealing with poverty, but even these would not be sufficient and would not be in order at a moment of emergency.

If next winter there be great distress, what, it may be asked, can possibly be done? The chief strain must undoubtedly be borne by the Poor Law, and the Poor Law must follow rules—hard-and-fast lines. The simplest rule is indoor relief for all applicants, and if for able-bodied men the relief take the form of work which is educational its helpfulness will be obvious. The casual labourer, whose family is given necessary support on condition that he enters the House, may during his residence learn something of whitewashing, woodwork, and baking, or, better yet, that habit of regularity which will do much to keep up the home which has been kept together for him.

The Poor Law can thus help during a time of pressure without any break in its established system. If more is necessary, perhaps the next best form of relief would be an extension of that adopted by the Whitechapel Committee of the Mansion-House Fund. By co-operation with other local authorities the Guardians might offer more work at street sweeping, or cleaning—which in poor London is never adequately done—under such conditions of residence or providence as would prevent immigration, but would be free of the degrading associations of the stone-yards. The resources at the disposal of the Guardians would enable them to try the experiment more effectively than was possible when a voluntary committee without experience, time, or staff had to do everything.

By some such plans relief could be afforded to all who belong to what may be called the lowest class. For the assistance of those who could be helped by tools, emigration, or money, the great Friendly Societies, the Society for Relief of
Distress, and the Charity Organisation Society might act in conjunction. These societies are unsectarian, are already organised, and may be developed in power and tenderness to any extent by the addition of members and visitors.

These means and all means which are suggested seem sadly inadequate, and in their very setting forth provoke criticism. There are no effectual means but those which grow in a Christian society. The force which, without striving and crying, without even entering into collision with it, destroyed slavery will also destroy poverty. When rich men, knowing God, realise that life is giving, and when poor men, also knowing God, understand that being is better than having, then there will be none too rich to enter the kingdom of heaven and none too poor to enjoy God's world.

Samuel A. Barnett.
A CHARITY CLEARING HOUSE

Two streams or tendencies seem to be apparent in human affairs. One makes for central control, for grand universal schemes, for imperialism; and in social matters is represented by the Socialist and Salvationist programmes. The other makes for independent effort, for distinction of class and sect, for nationalism; and in social matters is represented by parochial and sectarian charities.

Many who are most anxious to promote moral and social progress trust to the tendency which exalts the State above voluntary societies. They are impatient of the peddling efforts of sects and individuals, and look for one authority which will educate all the children and relieve all the poor. They condemn the will-worship which inspires many of the charities—the anxiety of each sect to do everything that is done by another sect, the vanity of the society lady who has her own orphanage and her own club and her own institution, the regard for official rights which keeps a charity going for the sake of its secretary. They point to the futility of the voluntary efforts, the clashing of their operations, the cruelty of their tender mercies, the poverty they develop, the greed and ingratitude which follow in their train.

They are right and they are also wrong in their condemnation. They are right in noting the paltry conceit and the will-worship which spoil many charities, but they are wrong in not accepting facts and in not recognising that there is something besides will-worship in sectarianism.

Socialists have their own faults. They are impatient of

1 Reprinted by permission from Newberry House Magazine, 1892.
drudgery, they are believers in machinery rather than in men, and while their aim is to socialise the result of individual effort, their practice often is to destroy individual effort; but their chief mistake is that they do not accept facts.

A very evident fact is the existence of the independent charities. The appearance of these charities is as marked a feature of the times as is the appearance of Socialism, and the growing thickness of the Charities Register cannot be ignored. It is folly to preach that nothing can be done till the State begins to act, to say that Relief Societies, Orphanages, Missions are of no use, and that all reform must be deferred until Society acts as a whole. It is worse than folly to assume that will-worship and vanity inspire all the independent efforts to do good. There is a principle in dissent, the principle of individualism. Men who are made with their own characters must express themselves in accord with those characters, and many of the charitable agencies represent the activities of the various characters of humanity.

If, however, this fact be accepted, that many religious and philanthropic agencies exist, and if it be allowed that they have a force of their own, the question remains, how can they be combined to promote moral and social progress?

(1) The obvious course is to strengthen each agency. Health is the first condition of all effort, and an unhealthy or weak society is in everyone's way. It is excellent that societies, like men, 'should have a giant's strength.' The common concern is that each society should be strong, and that each may be strong it is the duty of everyone concerned for social progress to join a society. There is an abundant choice—sectarian and unsectarian agencies, societies for relief and for education, orphanages and asylums, School Boards, Poor Law Boards, and Local Government Boards—among them almost any taste might be satisfied. It is impossible to be ignorant that some of the most enlightened reformers are unwilling to join any Board or Society; they criticise their operations, and from their superior standpoint dictate the right way. I submit that they themselves should join a society, and by their mind and action
strengthen its work. Perhaps, no one should be eligible for a Charity Organisation Committee or Council who is not himself an active worker in connection with some State or voluntary relief agency.

It would be a far cry, but not altogether a useless one to raise, that every Church member should also be a member of a local board or some active society. The ordinary congregation affords a very inadequate representation of the Church militant, and the paid agent can only do very little compared with what might be done if everyone pledged to fight under Christ’s banner against sin, the world, and the devil did engage in the battle. The war to-day is not against the heathen who occupy His holy sepulchre, or even against error, it is against the dirt and disease which occupy the temple of the Holy Ghost, and against the ignorance which leaves God’s children without God’s teaching.

The place in which to fight the modern enemy is pre-eminently on the Local Boards, with whom it rests to let in light on dark places, to destroy unhealthy dwellings, to open spaces for play and rest, and to extend knowledge through libraries and schools. It would be well if some good church-goers who now give could be made to serve, and if others could be called off from isolated efforts at giving and teaching and made to do their duty as Vestrymen, as Guardians, or even as active members of a society. There is more self-sacrifice required for dull committee business than for some missionary enterprises, and it is a self-sacrifice demanded by others’ needs.

(2) Then each society should be asked to define the limit of its operations. At present Church and Chapel, State and Voluntary relief seem to aim at covering the same ground. If, following the example of Abraham, they would divide the land, and if a rivalry arose as to who should say, ‘If thou goest to the east I will go to the west, or if thou goest to the west, I will go to the east,’ there would be a great accession of strength to the common cause. The Guardians, for example, might say that they would limit their operations to indoor relief, and then aim at making the infirmary such
that every sick person should be helped with the best help for body and mind, and at making the workhouse a real training school where the unskilled could learn a trade and the lazy get discipline. The Church might surrender its claim to send relief all over the parish, and, for relief purposes at any rate, agree that certain districts should be left to the care of the Mission or Chapel. The agencies started for teaching might confine themselves strictly to teaching, and the societies with special objects, such as the aged or the children, might keep themselves to those objects.

It would be interesting if every relief agency in any neighbourhood were to make a statement of its real aim, setting forth its objects and the limit within which those objects were to be sought. If then a map could be published showing the overlapping of effort, the neglect of one district and the indulgence of another, the sight might, perhaps, induce a self-denying ordinance and bring about a resignation of rights. Probably there are enough visitors in many neighbourhoods to befriend each poor family, so that none unknown would fall to the ground, and so that relief might be given without demoralisation. But because the visitors of each organisation try to see all the poor, they become the friends of none, and the poor feel their visits to be intrusions. The religious and philanthropic forces, restraining themselves to do what it is in their power to do well, and limiting their work by local or other boundaries, would, probably, deal adequately with poverty and thus make one step in progress.

It is to some extent this want of well-defined limits which leads to that jealousy which tends to destroy the charity of the charitable. If the poor would write their experiences, what tales would be told of visits of rival visitors in which bids were made for favour; what comments on the Christianity of missionaries who have revealed their rivalry by words of doubt about other missionaries! It is no wonder that the belief that the charitable 'serve God for nought,' grows weak when the competition for cases to relieve is almost as great as the tradesman's competition for customers to serve. And if
the poor could tell the effects of jealousy on their minds, what could not secretaries of societies tell of the effects of jealousy on their committees, the suspicion with which proposals are received, the limits on action imposed by personal considerations, the anxiety for advertisement, the irritation of fancied slights! The evidence of jealousy has often been so great as to leave a sort of serpent's trail over the scene of charitable action, and to make some onlookers wish that there had been no relief, no giving of pensions, no helping of children—so that at any rate the people might have been free of the suspicion which breeds doubt and remained ignorant of the evil which destroys faith. Jealousy will, of course, yield to nothing less strong than the spirit of Christ, and it is useless to think that any form of organisation will have permanent effect on human nature; but if the limits of work were defined, some eager ambitions would be controlled, and at any rate reason would have more force when it urged, 'Be content to do well your own work.'

(3) There should be a sort of Charities' Clearing House—a place where, week by week, the representatives of various charities could meet to pass out to the several agencies work fitted to each. It must, of course, happen that relieving officers find children who can be helped by the Children's Aid Society, or girls needing befriending, or people who could be raised by alms, or houses unfit for habitation. It might not be the relieving officer's duty to offer anything but the indoor treatment, but at the clearing house he would pass on what he had discovered, and hear in return of people whose cases demanded either infirmary or industrial treatment. In the same way the Church visitors would find cases in their districts fitted for pensions, or some kind of special relief, and they would hear of others in other districts needing visiting; these they would pass over, and receive in return information valuable to themselves. It has happened lately that one charitable periodical has been making pathetic appeals for funds to complete an orphanage for which it is said many orphans are waiting, while at the same time ladies have been writing to
the same periodical pleading that orphans may be sent to occupy their orphanage, or be adopted in their families. The weekly meeting of the Charity Organisation Committees might, I think, have more of this clearing house character. If representatives of charities met to compare notes, and to agree together as to who should do one thing and who another, organisation would come of itself. Organisation, like other of the best things, is born and not made.

But practical suggestions such as these are easily offered, and many more in the same direction might be added. Everyone knows they will not be adopted until the mind of the charitable is changed. Preachers of all reform, social and religious, have to begin with the text, ‘Ye must be born again.’

It may be that practice influences the mind, and that they who meet often will want to work together, but it is not till charitable people have a different mind—until they are born again—that they will work effectively for progress.

(1) The chief lesson they have to learn is self-denial in work. Mr. Brooke Lambert, in some sermons on Pauperism—which after twenty-five years are not out of date—dwells on the self-restraint of Christ, who, when He found many sick folk at the Pool of Bethesda, healed only one. Our good people are not content unless they can heal all they see, and reach all of whom they hear. They have need to learn the sacrifice of ‘not doing.’ The servant must not be above his Lord.

For some it will be sufficient motive to be as their Lord, and in His strength they will endure to see starvation and suffering, while they devote all their energies to do the best for the one child, or the one idler, or the one couple which has been delivered to their care. They will resist the calls of their own feelings, or the fashion of the day, saying to themselves, ‘It is His way and His will.’ They will be ashamed of making the excuse, ‘I could not bear to see such suffering.’ Charity is not to relieve oneself, but to relieve the poor.

Others will require proof: they will, like Thomas, ask to see the prints of the nails in His hands and His feet; that is,
they will want to know the results of this wholesale charity, the effect on the poor and the sick of the great schemes. If they will have patience to look, it is not hard to see the results. It is because of the competition of charities that the poor so often become liars and beggars. It is so natural to hide from the Church visitor the call of the Chapel visitor, so natural to defy the examination of the relieving officer; and having begun by the deceit of silence to go on to the deceit of invention. Methods of relief have done much to destroy the virtue of truthfulness among large classes of the people. It is so natural, too, to trust that the gift of to-day will be repeated on the morrow; to linger, thinking the visitor will come, and so miss the job of work. Trusting in chance is the frequent cause of starvation. It is because, lastly, of the charity which is ambitious to do so much that relief is so often inadequate and ill-advised. ‘Where (a visitor sometimes asks) is the girl I saw last week?’ ‘Oh,’ is the answer, ‘the curate found her, and has sent her for a country holiday.’ The curate, ignorant of the visitor’s knowledge, has perhaps done the wrong thing.

A patient examination of results and the realisation of the deceit, the suffering, and the mischief which have followed much alms-giving, may strengthen those who are unmoved by the example of Christ to hold their hands and be content to do well the small things committed to them.

(2) But as well as self-denial in their work it seems to me that each charitable society needs to have an ideal for Society. A nation, it has been said, is only really great when it has a sense of a mission. Certainly those nations which are concerned only with the increase of their own wealth, and have no dreams of international relations, are neither the happiest nor the most useful. And those charitable societies which are concerned only with their own objects, those religious bodies which say, ‘What have we to do with economics or politics?’ those parochial institutions which care for nothing beyond the welfare of the parish, those children’s societies which take no notice of the wants of the old and the sick, all those institutions which have no complete ideal, are not fully pro-
moting social and moral progress. Each society must indeed be strong, and each must do its own work, but it must also have before it an end of which its work will only be a part, it must see a whole in which its own efforts will be lost.

Strong individuals make a strong community. Strong societies, individualistic in their work, with the character and the force which individualism gives, would, by the power of a common ideal, work together for good.

Canon Scott Holland gave credit, in a recent sermon, to the Socialists, because they alone, among modern reformers, have a definite ideal for society. Their ideal is not the only ideal. It is as possible to conceive of men retaining their liberty and caring for others as it is to conceive of a benevolent State enforcing such care. It is as possible to think of individuals and societies inspired by the enthusiasm of humanity for the common good, as it is to think of the same forces restrained by the power of the majority from doing evil.

If an English Churchman were to sit down and dream of days to come, he need not see the Church supreme, but as one of the religious forces working together with Roman Catholics and Dissenters to justify God to man. If the Poor Law Guardian, stern in his belief in the indoor policy, were in his turn to think of the future, he need not see all charity and all relief merged in an attempt to get everyone who needs relief into the House; he might also see Pension Societies and Relief Societies, Befriending Societies, all actively engaged co-operating with his own Board. If the members of any society were in thought to throw themselves into the days to come, they might learn that not only they, but rival societies, are necessary to relieve and educate the poor.

The poor, the ignorant, and the wicked must be in the world. Are they to be dealt with by the State at last made benevolent and wise, by the hands, that is to say, of instruments at last made honest and tender? Or are they to be dealt with by charitable agencies, at last made strong and effective?
I am not in a position to give an answer as if I were a judge, but I would appeal to the members of relief and charitable agencies, and to them I would say that they have in their power to deal with the social problem. They might, by service and work, make their societies strong, and then they might make them human by keeping before themselves an ideal in which Church and Chapel, State relief and Voluntary charity, agencies for the young and agencies for the old, all co-operate for the good of the poor.

Years ago it was said, 'The great want of the Charity Organisation Society is a poet,' and this want has not been met. Facts have been given, and arguments have been urged, to show that organised charity might reform society. Devoted lives—which, perhaps, as Browning says, are the true poets—have been and are given to the service of the Society. But there has been no word-picture inspired by the thought of life, as life would be when every generous effort, every high principled act, every gift and every refusal to give, are aimed by Love and Wisdom to meet human needs. The thought of vigorous individualities, rejoicing as strong men to run their course, free to be and to do, and yet co-operating, in restraint and in action, to save the people, is surely as inspiring as the thought of a benevolent State making the way smooth for the progress of the poor and the weak.

While there is no poet to inspire the members of the Charity Organisation Society, the members would, I think, do well to spend some time in dreaming. Perhaps it is because they have been such 'deadly doers' that they have (comparatively speaking) done so little. If they dreamt more of the ideal, which is far off, but, nevertheless, along their own line of work, they would attract the forces that lie around, and attraction is, after all, the best method of organising.

SAML. A. BARNETT.
PASSIONLESS REFORMERS

The mention of the poor brings up to most people's minds scenes of suffering, want, and misery. The vast number of people who, while poor in money, are rich in life's good, who live quiet, thoughtful, dignified lives, are forgotten, and the word 'poor' means to many the class which may be called degraded. But the first class is by far the largest, and the wide East End of London (which the indolent think of only as revolting) contains at a rough calculation, say, twenty of the worthy poor to one of the degraded poor. It is curious how widely spread is the reverse idea. Many times have I been asked if I am not 'afraid to walk in East London,' and an article on the People's Entertainment Society aroused, not unjustly, the anger of the East London people at the writer's descriptions of them and of her fears for her personal safety while standing in the Mile End Road! One lady, after a visit to St. George's-in-the-East and Stepney, expressed great astonishment to find that the people lived in houses. She had expected that they abode, not exactly in tents, but in huts, old railway carriages, caravans, or squatted against a wall. East Londoners will be glad to know that she went back a wiser and not a sadder woman, having learnt that riches are not necessary to refinement, that some of the noblest characters are developed under the enforced self-control of an income of a pound or thirty shillings a week, that love can and does live side by side with poverty without thought of exit by the

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Fortnightly Review of August 1882.
window though poverty may have trodden a beaten path through the door; and that books and ideas, though not plentiful enough to become toys, were read, loved, and lived with until they became part of the being of their possessors.

But distinct from this class—among whom may be counted some of the noblest examples of life—there is the class of degraded poor. Here the want is not so much a want of money (some of the trades, such as hawking, flower-selling, shoe-blacking, occasionally bringing in as much as from ten to twenty shillings a day) as the want of the common virtues of ordinary life. In many of these poor, the mere intellectual conception of principle, as such, is absent; they have no moral ideal; spirituality to them is as little understood in idea as in word. Sinning (sensual low brutal sins) is the most common, the to-be-expected course. The standard has got reversed, and those who have turnings towards, and vague aspirations for, better things too often find it impossible to give these feelings practical expression in a society where wrong is upheld by public opinion; where the only test of right is the avoidance of being ‘nabbed’ by the police; and the highest law is that expressed by the magistrate.

How can these people be raised to enjoy spiritual life? Too often the symptoms are mistaken for the disease. In times of illness, bad weather, or depression of their particular trade, their poverty is the one apparent fact about them, and tender-hearted people rush eagerly to relieve it. That poverty was but the natural result of their sinful, self-indulgent lives; and by it they might have learnt great lessons. The hands of the charity-giver too often, in such cases, act as a screen between a man and his Almighty Teacher. The physical suffering which should have recalled to him his past carelessness or sin is thus made of no avail. Mistaken love! gifts cannot raise these people. Better houses, provident clubs, savings banks, &c., are all useful and do necessary work in forming a good ground in which the seed can grow, but thought must be given lest such efforts leave the people in the condition of more comfortable animals.
Materialism is already so strong a force in the world that those who look deeper than the material part of man should beware lest they accentuate what is, in whatever form it appears—whether in the low sensuality of the degraded or the enervating luxury of the aesthete—a circumscribed ungodly life.

The stimulus of 'getting on' is also used, but it is a dangerous influence, sapping oftentimes the one virtue which is strong and beautiful in the lives of these people, their communistic love; and if adopted by minds empty of principle may become a new source of wrong. 'Getting on' without regard to the means is but another way of going back.

Influences calling themselves religious are tried, and chiefly, all honour be to them, by the evangelicals who, filled with horror at what they hold to be the ultimate fate of such masses, go fearlessly and perseveringly among them, preaching earnestly, if not always rationally, their special tenets. Heaven, as a material place, they still paint in the poetic terms which represented to the Oriental mind the highest spiritual happiness, and is offered as a reward to men imbued with the materialistic spirit of the age and living coarse and sensual lives. Hell, as a place of physical suffering, is so often threatened that it becomes to many people the most likely thing that they shall go there. The story is perfectly true of the clergyman who, preaching to one of these oft-threatened congregations, tried to show them that a state of sin, which he explained to be alienation from God, was hell, and that the awfulness of hell did not consist in being a place where the body would be uncomfortable, but in being a state from which all good was absent. Walking behind some of his hearers afterwards, he overheard one say, 'Parson says there be'ant no hell, Dick. Where be you and I to go then?' Imagine feeling homeless because there may be no hell!

But even if the talk of hell still awakens some fear and dread, it is again only a material horror—it but exaggerates the importance of the body, and projects into an after-death sphere the selfish animal life already being led. This will
not cultivate spirituality. No! religion thus materialised is a dead letter; it will not feed the spiritual needs of the people. We have forgotten the words of the Divine Teacher about casting pearls before the swine, and the swine have turned again and rent us. As an old Cornish coachman said the other day in answer to a question about the services of a church which we happened to be passing, 'Ay, yes, there's a great advance in church activity, no doubt of that, but little in spirituality somehow. The people's souls have been preached to death.'

The religionists have taught until the people know all and feel nothing; they have talked about religion till it falls in the hearer's ears. They have blasphemed by asking pity for our Lord's physical sufferings when His thoughts and being were at one with God; when He was exulting—as only noble souls can faintly conceive of exultation—in His finished work.

Religion has been degraded by these teachers until it is difficult to gain the people's ears to hear it. I have often watched congregations who, keenly interested so long as personal narratives are told, books discussed, or allegories pictured, relax their attention so soon as religion is reverted to with an air which is told in every muscle of 'knowing all that.' The story once humorously told by the lamented Leonard Montefiore of his experience as a Sabbath-school teacher is a little straw showing withal the way of the stream. Feeling somewhat at a loss as to what to teach, the class being a strange one, he thought he would be safe in telling them a Bible story; so he began on Moses' history, painting, as only he could paint for children's minds, the conditions of the times, making Egypt, with its gorgeous palaces and age-defying temples, live again, showing the princess as a very fairy one, and letting them see through his well-cultivated mind the very age of Rameses. All went well, the children breathless with interest, until he came to the familiar incident of the little ark and the crying babe—'Oh! 'tis only Moses again!' cried one boy, and their interest vanished; they half
felt they had been 'taken in,' and for the remainder of the
lesson they gave him a bad time.

The experience of many a popular preacher would, if he
confessed honestly, be much the same as Mr. Montefiore's.
One body of evangelists, in order to attract the people, started
a band which, playing loud blatant marches or swinging
hymn tunes, brought hundreds of people, who sat and listened
with interest to the music. On its stopping, and the preacher
rising to speak, the people got up and poured out through the
large open gate. The preacher paused, and on a sign the
music recommenced and the audience sat down again. Three
times was the effort made. No! though the preacher
was advertised as the converted swindler or gipsy, or some
such attractive title, it was of no avail. The people would
not listen to the 'old, old story'—'Bless you, my children,'
said he, at last, sitting down in despair, 'but I wish you'd
mend yer manners.' It was a larger rent than their manners
which wanted mending. These people's lives are already too
full of excitement. There is no rest nor repose in them.
Dignity has given way to hurry. To attract them to religion
further excitement is often resorted to, and sensationalism with
all its vulgarity is brought to play upon the buried soul which
we are told we should 'possess in quietness.'

I was once present at a religious meeting where the
preacher narrated, with much gusto, accounts of sudden and
unexpected deaths and the ultimate fate of the dead ones,
making the ignorant audience feel fearful that their every
breath might be their last. Finding that even this did not
sufficiently stir the people, he pleaded that God in His mercy
'would shut the doors of hell—aye, even with a bang!'—
for a few moments until he had saved the souls before him.
After the word 'bang' he paused in an attitude of attention
as if listening to hear the slamming doors. The excitement
was intense; many weak-minded people went into hysterics,
and others hastened to be converted and 'made safe' while
the hell-doors were shut. Such means have some religionists
adopted to teach the people the Gospel!
No, alas! the old channels are no longer available for the water of life; without it the people are dead, live they ever so comfortably. A spiritual life is the true life; as men become spiritualised, as the moral ideal becomes the source of action, the old words and forms may regain meaning. Phrases now to them meaning nothing or only superstition will then express their very being; but without a belief in the ideal they are but empty words, like 'the sounding brass or tinkling cymbal.'

How can these degraded people be given these priceless gifts? The usual religious means have failed, the unusual must be tried; we must deal with the people as individuals, being content to speak, not to the thousands, but to ones and twos; we must become the friend, the intimate of a few; we must lead them up through the well-known paths of cleanliness, honesty, industry, until we attain the higher ground whence glimpses can be caught of the brighter land, the land of spiritual life.

Hitherto the large number of degraded people have appalled the philanthropist; they have been spoken of as the 'lapsed masses'; and efforts to reach them have not been considered successful unless the results can be counted by hundreds. But there is the higher authority for the individual teaching: He whom all men now delight to honour, whose life, words, and actions are held up for imitation; He chose twelve only for His especial influence; He spent long hours in conversation with single persons; He thought no incident too trivial to inquire into, no petty quarrel beneath His interference. We must know and be known, love and be loved, by our less happy brother until he learn, through the friend whom he has seen, knowledge of God whom he has not seen. All this must be done, and not one stone of practical helpfulness left unturned, and

God's passionless reformers, influences
That purify and heal and are not seen,

must be summoned also to give their aid. Among these are flowers, not given in bundles nor loose, but daintily arranged
in bouquets, brought by the hand of the friend who will stop to carefully dispose them in the broken jug or cracked basin, so that they may lose none of their beauty as long as the close atmosphere allows them to live: flowers (without textcards) left to speak their own message, allowed to tell the story of perfect work without speech or language; all the better preachers because so lacking in self-consciousness.

Not second among such reformers may be placed high-class music, both instrumental and vocal, given in school-rooms, mission-rooms, and, if possible, in churches where the traditions speak of worship, where the atmosphere is prayerful, and where the arrangement of the seats suggests kneeling; just the music without a form of service, nor necessarily an address; only a hymn sung in unison and a blessing from the altar at the close. To hear oratorios—St. Paul, the Messiah, Elijah, Spohr’s Last Judgment—I have seen crowds of the lowest class, some shoeless and bonnetless, and all having the ‘savour of the great unwashed,’ sit in church for two hours at a time quietly and reverently, the long lines of seated folk being now and then broken by a kneeling figure, driven to his knees by the glorious burst of sound which has awakened strange emotions; while the almost breathless silence in the solos has been occasionally interrupted by a heart-drawn sigh.

To trace the result is impossible and not advisable; but who can doubt that in those moments, brief as they were, the curtain of the flesh was raised and the soul became visible, perhaps by the discovery startling its possessor into new aspirations?

One man came after such a service for help, not money help, but because he was a drunkard, saying, ‘If I could hear music like that every night I should not need the drink.’ It was but a feeble echo of St. Paul’s words, ‘Who can deliver me from the body of this death?’ a cry—a prayer—which given to music might be borne by the sweet messenger through heaven’s gate to the very throne beyond.

Then there are country visits; quiet afternoons in the country, not ‘treats’ where numbers bring wild excitement,
and only the place, not the sort of amusement, is changed; but where a few people spend an afternoon quietly in the country, perhaps entertained at tea by a kindly friend; parties at which there is time to feel the quiet; where the moments are not so full of external and active interests that there is no opportunity to 'possess the soul'; parties at which there is a possibility of 'hush' in which, helped by Nature's ritual, perfect in sound, scent, and colour, silent worship can go on.

For people spending long years in the close courts and streets of ugly towns, the mere sight of nature is startling, and may awaken longings, to themselves strange and indescribable, but which are the stirrings of the life within.

The stories of great lives, and of other religions, very simply told, as far as possible leaving out the foreign conditions which confuse the ignorant mind, are sometimes helpful. It is generally considered wise to hide from children and untutored people the knowledge of other religions, for fear it should awaken doubts concerning their own; but in those cases where their own is so very negative, it is often helpful to learn of faiths held by the large masses of mankind. To hear that the great fundamental ideas of all worships are similar would perhaps suggest to the hearer that there might be more in it than 'just parson stuff' and lead him to inquire further; or, if it did not do this, it would be some gain to remove the ignorance which, more than familiarity, breeds contempt of the despised foreigner.

Once, after a talk about Egypt and its old religion, the Osiris worship, the beautiful story of the virgin Isis and her son Horus, who was slain by Set, the King of Evil, and rose again from the bosom of the Nile, I heard it said, 'They thought the same then, did they? only called them different names.' The largeness of the idea caught the hearer; its universality bore testimony to its truth. Would it not be helpful if our religious teachers, instead of spending their precious time denouncing the errors of other religions, would take the truths running through the great stories common to them all, and in an historical attitude of mind show the growth of
thought, the development of spirituality till his hearers are brought face to face with the Founder of our religion, who set the noblest example; taught the purest doctrine; lived the highest spiritual life; was in Himself, to use the Bible words, 'the way, the truth, and the life'?

Again, to be quiet, to be alone are among influences that purify. Every one when abroad has, I suppose, felt the privilege of being able to go into the churches whenever they wished. In our great towns the privilege is equally needed, and, where the poor live, doubly so. When one room has to be shared by the whole family, sometimes including a lodger, there can be no quiet, and loneliness is impossible. Some of the clergy are recognising this want, and open their churches at other than service times, but the practice is still rare. A notice outside our church tells how those may enter who 'wish to think or pray in quietness.' About ten a day use the permission, some of them kneeling shyly in the side aisle, as if their attitude were unwonted and caused shame; others sitting quietly for a long time, as if weary of the grind and noise outside; while sometimes men come to make their midday prayer. Here again is a means with invisible results; but quiet and loneliness are possessions to which every one has a right, without which it is difficult, almost impossible, to 'commune with God,' and the gift of which is still to be given to the poor.

Then there is the beauty of Art, now almost entirely absent from the dwellings of the poor, and yet by them so felt as a pleasure; the beauty of form and colour, which it is possible to show in schoolroom and church decoration; the beauty of light and brightness, the beauty of growth to be seen in gardens and churchyards. Outside our church are planted two Virginia creepers; poor things they are, hardly to be recognised by their relations in kindlier soil. But once, in a third-class carriage, we were interested to hear the church described as the one 'where the jennies grewed.'

It is easier now (thanks to the Kyrle Society and Miss Harrison's generous gifts of work) to make school and mission
rooms pretty. A beautiful workroom is a very strong though invisible influence. One girl, who had to leave our school on account of moving from the neighbourhood, said quite naturally, among her regrets at leaving and her description of the new school, 'It is so ugly, it makes one not care.'

The pictures in a school-room should be various, and, if possible, often changed. Pictures of action or of historical incidents are the most generally appreciated, but pictures of flowers, fairy tales, landscapes, and sea are suggestive.

Picture galleries have hitherto been thought of chiefly as pleasure places for the educated, or as schools for the student. They can become mission-halls for the degraded. It is easy to arrange visits with a few people to the National Gallery, to the Kensington or Bethnal Green Museums; it is not an unpleasant afternoon's work to guide little groups of people, just pointing out this beautiful picture, or putting in a few words to explain this or that historical allusion. I once took a girl—a merry lassie, light-hearted, fond of pleasure, but in danger of taking it at the expense of her character—to the National Gallery. The little picture of Raphael's, where the women acting as the angels stand over the sleeping knight, offering him the protecting shield, opened to her a new truth. Here was a fresh possible relation between man and woman, not the one of rough jokes and doubtful fun, but a new connection not to be despised, either, where the province of the woman was to keep the man safe; a large lesson taught by dumb lips and dead hands.

When Sir Richard Wallace lent his pictures to the Bethnal Green Museum he not only brightened the eyes of many used only to the drear monotony of East London, but he taught something to one poor wretched woman with a whining baby hanging on her thin breast. Dirt on child and mother showed her condition, and was a dreary contrast to the Madonna with lovely crowing baby before whom the little group paused. 'Ah, yer could easy enough “mother” such a baby as that now,' was her apologetic remark, showing that the picture had conveyed the rebuke, and that the reverence
born of faith in the painter's heart had not yet finished bearing fruit.

It is but feebly that I have tried to show how such means could be used to teach spirituality to the lowest classes. It is not necessary to speak of school-lessons, lending libraries, mothers' meetings, night-schools, temperance societies, and clubs—agencies for the good of the people which are at work in every well-organised parish. Neither has mention been made of the communicants' meetings, prayer assemblies, church services, which are food to feed and build up many of those who already recognise their true life, and strive bravely, amid adverse circumstances, to live it. We can all work at these in gladness and thanksgiving. They are not so hard to persevere with, for some result attends them. In meetings and classes there is encouragement in the regularity and the appreciation of the attendants. In services and prayer-meetings there is the knowledge that they help and strengthen the faint-hearted; but in the indirect means of helping the degraded there is little encouragement, for there can be no results. The highest work is often apparently resultless, bringing no personal thanks, no world's applause: a failure, worthless labour, if judged by the world's standard of work; a success, worth doing, if it open to a few, whom the usual means have failed to reach, the great secret of true being, their spiritual life—a buried life, buried but not dead.

Henrietta O. Barnett.
TOWN COUNCILS AND SOCIAL REFORM

Mr. Bright has stated that in Glasgow 41,000 families occupy single rooms. The statement caused no surprise to those familiar with the poor quarters of our great towns; their surprise has been that the statement should cause surprise in any section of the community. It is, indeed, strange that people should think so little about what they daily see, and should go on talking as if 20s. or 90s. a week were enough to satisfy the needs of a family's life, and should be surprised that many persons still occupy one room, endure hardship and die, killed by the struggle to exist. It is strange that reflection on such subjects is not more common because, when facts are stated, no defence is made for the present condition of the people.

Alongside of the growth of wealth during this age there has been growth of the belief in the powers of human nature, of the belief that in all men, independent of rank and birth, their exist great powers of being. 'Nothing can breed such awe and fear as fall upon us when we look into our minds, into the mind of man,' expresses the experience of many who do not use the poet's words.

Those who are conscious of what men may be and do cannot be satisfied while the majority of Englishmen live, in the midst of wealthy England, stinted and joyless lives because they are poor.

When facts, therefore, such as that referred to by Mr.

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Nineteenth Century of November 1883.
Bright are stated, no defence is made; and such facts are common. Here are some:—(1) The death-rate among the children of the poor is double that among the children of the rich. Born in some small room, which serves as the sleeping and living room of the family; hushed to sleep by discordant noises from neighbouring factories, refreshed by air laden with smoke and evil odours, forced to find their play in the streets; without country holiday or adequate medical skill, without sufficient air, space, or water; the children die—and the mothers among the poor are always weeping for their children and cannot be comforted. (2) The occupant of the prisons are mostly of one class—the poor. The fact for its explanation needs no assumption that 'the poor in a lump are bad'; it is the natural result of their condition. It is because children are ill-developed or unhealthily developed by life in the streets that they become idlers, sharers, or thieves. It is because families are crowded together that quarrels begin and end in fights. It is because they have not the means to hide their vices under respectable forms that the poor go to prison and not the rich. (3) The lives of the people are joyless. The slaves of toil, worn by anxiety lest the slavery should end, they have neither leisure nor calm for thought; they cannot therefore be happy, living in the thought of other times, as those are happy who, in reading or travel, have gathered memories to be the 'bliss of solitude,' or as those who, 'by discerning intellect,' have found the best to be 'the simple product of the common day.' When work ceases, the one resource is excitement. Anxiety thus consumes their powers in pleasure as in work; the faces of the women lose their beauty, and a woman of thirty looks old.

These are facts patent to those who know our great towns—the facts of life, not among a few of their degraded inhabitants, but facts of the life of the majority of the people. Let anyone who does not know how his neighbours live set himself the following sum. Given 20s. or 40s. a week as wages, how to keep a family, pay rent of 2s. 6d. a week for each room, and lay up an adequate amount for times of bad trade, sick-
ness, and old age. As the sum is worked out, as it is seen how one after another the things which seem to make life worth living have to be given up, and as it is seen how many ‘necessaries’ are impossible, how many of the poor must put up with a diet more scanty than that allowed to paupers, how all must go without the leisure and the knowledge which transmute existence into life—faith will be shaken in many theories of social reform.

Teetotal advocates will preach in vain that drunkenness is the root of all evil, and that a nation of abstainers will be either a healthy, a happy, or a thoughtful nation. Thrift will be seen to be powerless to do more than to create a smug and transient respectability, and even those who are ‘converted’ will not claim to be raised by their faith out of the reach of early death and poverty into a life which belongs to their nature as members in the human family.

Theories of reform which do not touch the conditions in which the people live, which do not make possible for them fuller lives in happier circumstances, are not satisfactory. The conversion of sinners—at any rate while the sinners are sought chiefly among the poor—the emigration of children, the spread of thrift and temperance among the workpeople, will still leave families occupying single rooms and the sons of men the joyless slaves of work, a state of society for which no defence can be made.

It is only a larger share of wealth which can increase comfort and relieve men from the pressure brought on them by the close atmosphere of great towns—which can, in a word, give to all the results of thought and open to all the life which is possible. If it be that the return for fair land laid waste by mines and engines is wider knowledge of men and things, it is only the rich who now enjoy this return, and it is only wealth which can make it common. And since any distribution of wealth in the shape of money relief would be fatal to the independence of the people, the one satisfactory method of social reform is that which tends to make more common among the many the good things which wealth has gained for the few.
The nationalisation of luxury must be the object of social reformers.

The presence of wealth is so obvious that the attempts to distribute its benefits both by individuals and by societies have been many. Individuals have given their money and their time; their failure is notorious, and societies have been formed to direct their efforts. The failure of these societies is not equally notorious, but few thinkers retain the hope that societies will reform Society, and make the conditions of living such that people will be able to grow in wisdom and in stature to the full height of their manhood. If it were a sight to make men and angels weep to see one rich man struggling with the poverty of a street, making himself poor only to make others discontented paupers, it is as sad a sight to see societies hopelessly beaten and hardened into machines with no 'reach beyond their grasp.'

The deadness of these societies or their ill-directed efforts has roused in the shape of Charity Organisation workers a most striking missionary enterprise. The history of the movement as a mission has yet to be written; the names of its martyrs stand in the list of the 'unknown good'; but the most earnest member of a Charity Organisation Society cannot hope that organised almsgiving will be powerful so to alter conditions as to make the life of the poor a life worth living.

Societies which absorb much wealth, and which relieve their subscribers of their responsibility, are failing; it remains only to adopt the principle of the Education Act, of the Poor Law, and of other socialistic legislation, and call on Society to do what societies fail to do. There is much which may be urged in favour of such a course. It is only Society, or, to use the title by which Society expresses itself in towns, it is only Town Councils, which can cover all the ground and see that each locality gets equal treatment. It is by common action that a healthy spirit becomes common, and the tone of public opinion may be more healthy when the Town Council engages in good-doing than when good-doing is the monopoly of individuals or of societies. If nations have been ennobled by
wars undertaken against an enemy, towns may be ennobled by work undertaken against the evils of poverty.

Through the centuries the sense of the duties of Society has been growing. Some earnest men may regret the limit placed on individual action and the failure of societies, but the change they regret is more apparent than real. The Town Councils are, indeed, the modern representatives of the Church and of other societies through which in older times individuals expressed their hope and work, and to these bodies falls the duty of effecting that social reform which will help the poor to grow to the stature of the life of men.

The problem before them is one much more of ways than of means. If poverty is depressing the lives of the people, the wealth by which it may be relieved is superabundant. On the one side, there is disease from the want of food and doctors; on the other side there is disease because of food and doctors. In one part of the town the women cease to charm for want of finery; in the other they cease to please from excess of finery. It is for want of money that the streets in which the poor live are close, ill-swept, and ill-lighted—that the ‘East Ends’ of towns have no grand meeting-rooms and no beauty. It is through superfluity of money that the entertainments of the rich are made tiresome with music, and their picture galleries made ugly with uninteresting portraits. There is no want of means for making better the condition of the people; and there has ever been sufficient good-will to use the means when the way has been clear. To discover the way is the problem of the times.

Some way must be found which, without pauperising, without affecting the spirit of energy and independence, shall give to the inhabitants of our great towns the surroundings which will increase joy and develop life.

The first need is better dwellings. While the people live without adequate air, space, or light in houses where the arrangements are such that privacy is impossible, it is hopeless to expect that they will enjoy the best things. The need has been recognised, and, happily without going to
Parliament, Town Councils may do much to meet the need. It is in their power to enforce sanitary improvements, to make every house healthy and clean, and to provide common rooms which will serve as libraries or drawing-rooms. If it is not in their power to reduce rents, it is possible for them to pull down unfit buildings, and sell the ground to builders at a low price on condition that such builders shall provide extra appliances for the health and pleasure of the people.

Insanitary conditions and high rents are the points to which consideration must be directed. Builders to-day build houses on the fiction that each house will be occupied by one family. The fact that two or three families will at once take possession is kept out of sight, while the parlour, drawing-room, and single set of offices are finished off to suit the requirements of an English home. The fiction ends in the creation of evils on which medical officers write reports, and of other evils which, like the Medusa's head, are best seen by the shadow they cast on society.

The insanitary conditions constitute one difficulty connected with the dwellings of the poor; the rent for adequate accommodation, which absorbs one quarter of an irregular income, constitutes another. To cure the insanitary conditions ample power exists; to even suggest a means for lowering rents is not so easy. Perhaps it might be possible for the community to sell the ground it acquires at some low price, on condition that the rents of the newly-built houses should never exceed a certain rate, and that the occupier should always have the right of purchase. Such a condition is not, however, at present legal and is of doubtful expediency.

It is now possible for Town Councils to acquire land under the Artisans' Dwellings Act, and to sell it cheaply on condition that the rooms are of a certain size and provided with certain appliances; that special arrangements are made for washing and cleaning, and that a common room is at the disposal of a certain number of families.

The improvement cannot be made without what is called a loss—that is to say, the Town Councils are unable to get for
land sold for the erection of fit dwellings the same price for which the land had been acquired under the Act. Money will in one sense be lost; and this phrase has such power that, though the need is recognised, the Act by which the need could be met has in most towns remained a dead letter.

In Liverpool—where, according to official reports, the state of the dwellings is productive of fever and destructive of common decency—the Act has never been applied. In Manchester, where it is acknowledged to be the object of the Town Council to protect the health of the people, it is stated in the last report that the Act involves too great an outlay to be workable. The London Metropolitan Board of Works, which spends its millions wisely and unwisely, has striven to show that the application of the Act would lay too great a burden on the ratepayers. It is impossible, it is said, to house the poor at such a cost.

It would not seem impossible if it were recognised that to spend money in housing the poor is a way of making the wealth of the town serve the needs of the town. It would not seem impossible if Town Councils recognised that on them has come the care of the people, and that money is not lost which is returned in longer and better life.

Other needs exist, hardly second to that of better dwellings, and these it is in the power of local authorities to meet in a way of which few reformers seem to be aware. The Town Councils may provide means of recreation and instruction—libraries, playgrounds, and public baths. School Boards may provide, not only elementary instruction, but give a character to education, and use their buildings as centres for the meetings, classes, and recreation of the old scholars. Boards of Guardians may make their relief, not only a means of meeting destitution, but a means of educating the independence of the strong and of comforting the sorrows of the weak. We can imagine these boards, the councils of the town, endowed with greater powers; but with those they already possess they could change the social conditions and remove abuses for which Englishmen make no defence.
Wise Town Councils, conscious of the mission they have inherited, could destroy every court and crowded alley and put in their places healthy dwellings; they could make water so cheap and bathing-places so common that cleanliness should no longer be a hard virtue; they could open playgrounds, and take away from a city the reproach of its gutter-children; they could provide gardens, libraries, and conversation-rooms, and make the pleasures of intercourse a delight to the poor, as it is a delight to the rich: they could open picture galleries and concerts, and give to all that pleasure which comes as surely from a common as from a private possession; they could light and clean the streets of the poor quarters; they could stamp out disease, and by enforcing regulations against smoke and all uncleanness limit the destructiveness of trade and lengthen the span of life; they could empty the streets of the boys and girls—too big for the narrow homes, too small for the clubs and public-houses—by opening for them playrooms and gymnasias; they could help the strong and hopeful to emigrate; they could give medicine to heal the sick, money to the old and poor, a training for the neglected, and a home for the friendless.

With this power in the hands of Town Councils, and with our great towns in such a state that a fact as to their condition shocks the nation, there is no need to wait for parliamentary action. The course on which the authorities are asked to enter is no untried one.

There are local bodies which have applied the Artisans' Dwellings Act and cleared away houses or hovels of which the medical officers' descriptions are not fit for repetition in polite society. There are those who have built, and more who are ready to build, houses which shall at any rate give the people healthy surroundings, possibilities of home life and of common pleasures, even when a family can afford only a single room. And, although the London School Board's buildings and playgrounds are occupied only during a few hours in each week, there are schools which are used for meetings, for classes in higher education, and for Art Exhibitions.
and there are playgrounds which are open all day and every
day to all comers.

The way in which Guardians have in some unions made the
system of relief in the highest sense educational is now an
old tale. It has been shown that out-relief, with its demoralising
results, may be abolished; it is being shown that a work-
house with trade masters and 'mental instructors' may be a
reformatory; and it is not beyond the hope of some boards
that a system of medical relief may be developed adequate
to the needs of the people. Public bodies here and there are
showing what it is in their power to do, but at present their
efforts hardly make any mark; they must become general.

The first practical work is to rouse the Town Councils to
the sense of their powers; to make them feel that their reason
of being is not political but social, that their duty is not to
protect the pockets of the rich, but to save the people. It is
for reformers in every town to direct all their force on the
Town Councils, to turn aside to no scheme, and to start no
new society, but to urge, in season and out of season, that the
care of the people is the care of the community, and not of
any philanthropic section—is, indeed, the care of Society, and
not of societies. 'The People, not Politics' should be their
cry; and they should see that the power is in the hands of
men, irrespective of party or of class, who care for the people.
This is the first practical work, one in which all can join,
whether he serves as elector or elected. It may be that efficient
administration will show that without an increase of rating a
sufficient fund may be found to do all that needs doing; but
if this is not the case, the social interest which is aroused will
act on Parliament, and that body will be diverted from its
party politics to consider how, by some change in taxation, by
progressive rating, by a land tax, or by some other means, the
money can be raised to do what must be done.

The means, I repeat, is a matter for the future; the battle
is to be won at the municipal elections; it is there the cry
'The People, not Politics' must be raised, and it is the councils
of the town which can work the social reform. If it be urged
that when Town Councils do for social reform all which can be done the condition will still be unsatisfactory, I agree. Wealth cannot supply the needs of life, and many who have all that wealth can give are still without the life which is possible to men. The town in which houses shall be good, health general, and recreation possible may be but a whitened sepulchre. No social reform will be adequate which does not touch social relations, bind classes by friendship, and pass, through the medium of friendship, the spirit which inspires righteousness and devotion.

If, therefore, the first practical work of reformers be to rouse Town Councils, their second is to associate volunteers who will work with the official bodies. We may here regret the absence of a truly National Church. If in every parish Church Boards existed representative of every religious opinion and expressive of every form of philanthropy, they would be the centres round which such volunteers would gather and prove themselves to be an agency ready to their hand. While we hope for such boards, there is no need to wait to act.

As a rule, it may be laid down that the voluntary work is most effective which is in connection with official work. The connection gives a backbone, a dignity to work, which has lost something in the hands of Sunday-school teachers and district visitors. In every town volunteers in connection with official work are wanted. It is doubtful, indeed, if the tenements occupied by the least instructed classes could be kept in order, or the people made to live up to their better surroundings, if the rent collecting were not put in the hands of volunteers with the time to make friends and the will to have patience with the tenants. At any rate, wherever official work is done there will be something for volunteers to supply.

Guardians want those who will consider the poor; men who will visit the workhouse to rouse those too idle or too depressed to work, and to find help for those who by sickness or ill-chance have lost their footing in the rush for a living. They want those who, knowing what wages can do and cannot do, will serve on relief committees, will see the poor in their
distress, and, giving or not giving, will try to make them understand that care does not cease. They want also women who will be friends to the sick and, more than that, befriend the girls who drift wretched to the workhouse, or go out lonely from the pauper schools. School Boards want those who, visiting the schools, will seek out the children who are fit for country holidays, visit the homes, and do something to follow up the education between the years of thirteen and twenty-one.

Wherever there is an institution, a reading-room, a club or a playground there is work for volunteers. It may not be that the volunteers will seem to do much; they will be certain to do something. They will be certain to make links between the classes, and lead both rich and poor to give up habits which keep them apart. They will be certain to add strength to the public opinion, which in time will relieve those whose higher life is destroyed by excess or by want. They will be certain to do something, and if they carry into their work a spirit of devotion, a faith in the high calling of the human race, and a love for its weakest members, there is no limit which can be placed on what they will do. They will put into the sound body the sound mind; into the well-ordered town the citizens who 'feel deep, think clear, and bear fruit well.'

Samuel A. Barnett.
HOW TO DEVELOP INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER IN THE CHILDREN COLLECTED TOGETHER IN LARGE PAUPER SCHOOLS

Just now we hear a great deal about pauper schools, and as there may be some who are not conversant with Poor Law work, it might be as well to say that pauper schools are where the children are kept who are supported by the rates. The children come in for various reasons. Sometimes because they are orphans, or have only a widowed mother too poor to support them; sometimes because they have been deserted by their natural—and yet unnatural—guardians; or perhaps they are the children of people whose poverty or dissolute lives have made the workhouse their only refuge.

Much is said about the evils of such schools, and the superior advantages of the boarding-out system. As to this system—though it is hardly possible to do it justice in so limited a space—ladies living in the country find, among their cottage neighbours, respectable families who are willing and able to adopt a child. The ladies (after forming themselves into a committee, and conforming to certain rules laid down for their guidance by the Local Government Board) apply for children to the Guardians of the poor in London and other large cities.

The Guardians, if they approve of the system, give into their care certain children, paying 4s. a week for their maintenance. The child goes to live in the house of its foster-

1 Reprinted from pamphlet published in 1886.
mother, shares in her joys, sorrows with her griefs, enters into
the life of the usual country child, and often happily loses
even recollection of the time spent in the dreary, ugly streets.

At the age of fourteen or fifteen, by the aid of the lady
friend, the first start in life is made, it is urged, with fairer
prospects than would have been possible had the little one
been left, as one of the many, to live out its early and
character-forming years in a large pauper school.

We hear also not a little about the superiority of the
cottage home system, which is that the children should be
placed in groups or families, not exceeding twenty, and
sometimes as few as twelve, under a superintendent or
mother.

It is believed that the children do in this way get a truer
knowledge of social relations and domestic work, and live, as
members of a family, a more natural and healthy life. The
plan has, no doubt, many and enormous advantages; only,
natural families don't usually number so many as twenty,
neither is it common for parents to be blessed with quite as
many children all of the same sex.

But, if we grant the superiority of these systems, yet
there are other facts which must be taken into consideration
before they can be adopted.

Last year there passed through the school in which I am
much interested 1,014 children; of these, 113 were sent to
work or to service. On the date these returns were made up
there were 585 in the school, thus leaving no less a number
than 479 who had been admitted and discharged during the
year. These are called casual children. For this class of
children neither the boarding-out nor the cottage system is
quite available, and even if they were, it must be remembered
that the schools are in existence. Immense sums of money
have been spent on their erection, and the Guardians can
hardly, in duty to the ratepayers, discard them to adopt new
schemes, however fairly they may promise.

In the Metropolitan area alone, though it has been difficult
to get the exact number, there are something like 10,000
children under education, for better or for worse. Their education being in our hands, the world will—humanly speaking — progress in proportion as we do our work well. In a sense, truer, perhaps, than in any other, we are, to these children, 'our brother's keepers.' God grant that we may not be, to a single one, his Cain.

Perhaps it would be as well not to talk so much about the evils existing in these institutions as to consider some methods which could be adopted in large schools to develop individual character and to prepare the children for their future life.

The chief faults of these schools, speaking generally, come from the massing of so many children together. The necessary discipline becoming routine, crushes out individual life. I say the necessary discipline advisedly, because with large numbers disorder would soon reign paramount if strict discipline were not maintained; but discipline too often begins to be admired for its own sake, and in certain schools one is shown, with pride, the children drilled into moving, even to eating and praying, simultaneously, while order, cleanliness, and tidiness have become ends in themselves instead of means of education. It is a difficult problem to know how to work this large organisation, so that while enough order is maintained to prevent one child from injuring another, yet there shall be room enough for individual growth.

Many plans have been suggested, some of which have been carried out in the large schools, Forest Gate, where I have, for more than six years, had a seat on the Board of Management, and which I must be pardoned for mentioning, while others are still but ideal, to be worked out, perhaps, in other schools, where the conditions are more favourable to their growth.

The other day we had some trouble with a girl of fourteen who had been stealing. She had stolen a brooch from the cook. She did not deny it, but simply said: 'I did not mean to keep it, but I had never had one, and I wanted it for a bit.' How much the remark implied. How almost impossible for
us, with our wealth of possessions, to understand the hungry
want in the poor child's mind, to have something 'for a bit.'

Let us, as the first experiment, give children something
of their own, and secondly, to avoid harmful disorder, a place
to keep it in. It will not entail great expenditure. Rows of
lockers in the day-room—one for each girl, or one to be shared
between two. Little possessions will come in. The relatives
'out of doors,' as they say, send Christmas cards and oc-
casional pennies, and soon mysterious crochet work and
samples grow out of these pennies. Self-respect somehow
follows ownership; care for the treasures produces tidiness,
and some important moral lessons get taught by the brown
wooden lockers. 'What have you got?' I asked one girl. 'I
have the box you gave me, two thimbles, five buttons and a
bit of tape.' An easily exhausted inventory given to me
during an uncomfortable conversation which it was necessary
to have concerning a missing shilling, for it would be useless
to deny that because the children are allowed and encouraged to
possess they occasionally take from each other; but surely
the sin is best faced and fought out under the kindlier eyes of
the school officials than in the police courts, when it has taken
deeper root and grown to alarming dimensions.

In some schools, and it was the case at Forest Gate a few
years ago, the children did not have their own clothes. They
had anyone's, everyone's, which happened to fit. It gives
more trouble, but has enormous moral significance if each
child can have his own. Let sets be marked with a number,
and all clothes with that number be apportioned to a child.
Then, if the apron is torn or the stocking roughly used, the
fault can be corrected, while with the other plan both waste
and deceit are encouraged, for is it not an almost overwhel-
ming temptation to declare, 'I did not do it,' when there is
nothing that can prove the contrary?

There is, I know, much variety of opinion about prizes as
an influence in education, and while sympathising with those
who hold that they encourage self-assertion, and make getting
instead of giving the principle of life, still in these schools.
where the conditions are so abnormal, they can be made, I think, to have a beneficial influence. By them a standard of work is created, and they are also one of the means by which the children can become possessors. It is difficult to know how to award prizes. The master and mistress can decide, though here there is always the risk of favouritism. They can be given by marks, or by competitive examinations; though perhaps the least harmful way is by setting a high standard in awarding a prize to each child who attains to that standard. In our school we try to teach the children the value of 'conduct' above acquirement by giving a prize, the receiver of which is chosen by the children themselves. Such qualities as kindness, generosity, helpfulness, amiability, *popular qualities*, as they may be called, generally obtain the most votes, but thought about conduct is awakened, and the children may grow to seeing the beauty of the sterner but greater characteristics.

The value of games as a method of developing character can hardly be over-estimated. Care should be taken that time is allowed for them, and appliances. It hardly matters how rough the appliances are, indeed in some cases their very roughness engenders ingenuity; and imagination grows as children have to 'make believe' in their play. It should be recognised that play is a necessity for the young, and play hours should not be regarded merely as an off-time for masters and educators. In the playground great lessons can be taught if the play hours be carefully planned for and filled with interest. If not so planned for they become sources of danger; a time when the 'evil communications which corrupt' something deeper than 'good manners' are made; a time when the lounging habit of life of the pauper, and 'dunno' and 'dunna care' condition of mind asserts itself; a time which the ingenious Spirit of Evil finds specially convenient to suggest mischief.

The boys could enjoy gymnastics, swings, and they might play football and have cricket clubs, perhaps uniting their pennies to purchase the football. The girls might be en-
couraged to swing, see-saw, and ride giant's-strides; but, besides these, it may sometimes be possible that ladies living in the neighbourhood could come in to teach them games. A few minutes spent in simple sing-song movement play might become the parent of many innocent hours, for the game so taught would be sure to be popular, and handed down through school generations.

Volunteers might also help in the giving out of books in the library. This should be done, if possible, during recreation hours, and, when practicable, on a half-holiday, so that there should be no hurry about it. Ladies, if two or three will go together, can then consult each child's taste, can give to the little homesick one cheering tales of happy domestic life, to the daring boy the story of impossible adventure, to the growing girl just about to face life the book teaching experience, or telling of probable dangers to be feared. Each child can, in some slight way, have its character trained, or at least be helped to feel individuality by having its taste consulted, in this simple way.

A carefully-chosen library, a catalogue printed, if possible, so that each child may be able to buy and possess one, and thus have the educating influence of choosing and making up his mind, and the help of volunteers, either men or women, to distribute books, are unsensational but not to be despised methods of developing character.

Going-out—the ‘walking exercise,’ as I believe it is generally called on time-tables—is now but a dreary function. How slowly the children move! How they drag their feet! How listless they seem! How utterly dull they appear to find it! How tired they are, almost as soon as they start! No wonder, walking as they do, two-and-two, their companion chosen for size, not compatibility, and no opportunity being given for exercise of individual tastes concerning flower-picking, wonder seeking, running or jumping.

But might not the ‘walking exercise’ become another method for developing individual character, if it could be so arranged that it should become the duty of an officer or
servant to take, say, six or eight children out any day during the hour put aside for recreation or out-door exercise? Ladies might volunteer to do this simple duty. It would have to be planned so that each child got a walk, but how different those walks would become. They would give opportunities for learning to know each child separately; shops could be visited, streets safely threaded, and such remarks as 'Well, I never saw a train go over a bridge before,' or the question put on May Day, 'Is it all the horses' birthday that they are dressed so smart?' or, 'I'm sure I don't know what it cost, the man took all the money and gave me three half-pence back, but I think he said it—the mutton—was three and fourpence a pound,' all of which I heard from a girl ten of whose fourteen years had been spent in a school. Such remarks would be soon as far off and as unbelievable as Mr. Bumble's expression of horror at 'Oliver's asking for more' now seems to us.

And this reminds us of meal times. Legally every child is obliged to have a regulated weight of food, and with the memory of past Olivers this is, no doubt, a wise regulation; but I have often seen children turn from the great hunks of food with distaste, in most cases it is more than they really want, so they play with it and leave it. Wasteful and untidy habits are thus produced. Talking at meal times has been tried with marked success, greediness lessens, if it does not disappear, amid the interest of the chatter, and the somewhat dull food becomes more palatable when talked over. But after each meal the pig-pail is still too rich, the broken fragments of food, and the more important broken fragments of the lessons which past frugality had taught, are still too many to be gathered up with pleasure. Would it not be possible to divide each child's portion into two, the second portion to be had for the asking? The rates would be saved by just that amount now wasted; but, more important, the children would be taught the lesson of care and thrift, for the want of which so many, later on, help to swell the rates.

School lessons have, undoubtedly, considerable influence in the forming of character, and, at present, I cannot but
think that they are made unnecessarily routine by being kept too much within standard lines. This might be altered by taking one or two special subjects, subjects, if possible, to be touched by the children's experience—such as physiology, where their own limbs and pulses can illustrate the lesson; or astronomy, which can be studied out of every bare dormitory window.

The school teachers can, if they will, feed their pupils' minds with tales of great lives, and stories of heroism, rousing even to the flabby pauper mind. In the long winter evenings a voluntary night school could perhaps be held, the children coming or not as they please, and having a voice in the choice of the subject taught. In our school, out of some two hundred boys the voluntary class rarely falls below eighty.

And here a word or two about those hours which are perhaps the most difficult to arrange for, namely, the evening off-work hours. As a rule, I believe, in most of these schools the children work too long and too hard. They become drudges, too many hours of labour sap their work of life and spirit; but this is not so much because the managers want them to work, or the school requires their labour, as because there is nothing for them to do except work.

A little thought will, though, suggest some possible time-spending ways. Besides the voluntary classes, the elder girls, who have spent all the day in house-work, could be gathered together for a sewing, cutting-out, or, still better, a patching evening, someone being chosen to read meanwhile, or all joining to sing—and of music they are particularly fond. It might be possible perhaps to have a quiet game-room for those who like quietness, where draughts, chess, and similar dissipation can be indulged in, one lad or girl being appointed master of the ceremonies, week by week or month by month, and held responsible for both order and games; while a hand organ will set the young ones dancing, with the grace which few years and joyousness always lends, and which even contracted-for boots—nearly always too large for the little feet—cannot altogether banish.
Play, played heartily, is in itself an education, while the work is done better if it be limited to certain hours. 'She drags all day over her work, and does it without any spirit,' will not fall upon the ears of the ladies who visit these girls in their situations as an original remark of mine. In different ways it comes from most mistresses of those girls who have been brought up in large industrial or district schools, and I trace it to the same source—the want of interest in their daily lives while inside these large schools. But this again can be in some degree counteracted by periodical entertainments or concerts; sometimes given by the officers who help to bring in the brighter outside life by inviting their friends, sometimes by the children; and great is the interest taken by the little reciters and small vocalists in that evening's entertainment! By occasionally providing an evening's pleasure, either at their own house or in the school, individual managers could, in some slight measure, refresh and enlarge the horizon of their staff, for dreary and deadening in its influence is the life of these schools on the officers.

But perhaps the chief method for 'preparing the children for their future life' is by keeping up the interest of their educators in great and good things; in widening and strengthening their lives by the sight of something not bounded by the school walls. 'Earth is crammed with heaven, and every common bush as fire with God' is true also of that portion of the earth which is covered by a pauper school; but eyes dulled by dreary monotony pass by the flaming bush. The God within and behind it is left unrecognised.

Beauty, to some extent, helps to refresh tired eyes, and is a refining influence to all inmates. Prettily-coloured, picture-decorated rooms, flowers in the windows, banners in the hall, all help, while appropriate mottoes which face one at every turn in workshop, dormitory, and school-room sow seeds of ideas which may perhaps bear their fruit in world-enriching action. Not that the words need always be within the children's comprehension, some must be for their elders; but later on the motto—which perhaps at school had only been a matter of
interest because containing such a number of letters, often and listlessly counted—as read by the light of experience, or through the gloom of sorrow, assumes new importance. 'He prayeth best who loveth best' might become the simple explanation of inexplicable theology; 'They also serve who only stand and wait' is true enough to shed dignity around a hospital bed; while 'Only cowards strike the weak' becoming common parlance in the mouths of the boys helps the labour master not a little in the quarrels which not unfrequently arise in the playground.

But important as these indirect methods are, the direct religious teaching is perhaps even more important. Sunday, the seventh part of the children's life, must be as carefully considered and planned for as the other six days. It is a difficult task to make it a rest day for the majority of the staff (a rest day not indeed unneeded if they are to be refreshed for their week's work) and also an intelligent, alive, and growing day for the children.

First, there is the service, too often held at an inconveniently early hour so as to enable the chaplain to get off elsewhere; but, apart from the hour, how seldom it really touches, either in prayers or sermons, the lives and needs of the children. It is a something done for them, not by them; a function performed in which they do their part if they 'don't misbelieve.' But it could be made a living influence. The singing which is done as usual school work could lead up to part-singing of the hymns, the best voices both of boys and girls being chosen for the choir. Some slight distinctive dress and different seats in the hall, where a chapel is impossible, would mark their position as choristers; while the lessons would be listened to, I fancy, with more interest if occasionally read by one of themselves. The service—while keeping within the law—could be varied, Sunday by Sunday, with such slight alterations as the sermon in the middle, an occasional extempore prayer mentioning any occurrence in the school history of the past week, a catechising on lately learnt Bible lessons, or an explanation in homely language of one of the beautiful,
but to children utterly incomprehensible, Church prayers before reading it. Small things, all of them, yet making a small hour in a small child’s day a preparation to enable him to meet big life.

I have wondered, too, if occasionally, at Harvest Festivals or Special Service times, the parson of the nearest church could not be asked to have a service chiefly for the children in these schools. The going out, the different church, the other worshippers, would give them a sense of union with that vast body of aspirers whose ‘many-noted cry ever goeth upward,’ and of which their little note, though very low down, is not the less full of pain.

But to return to the ordinary Sunday; the service over, the rest of the day is drear enough, such teaching as is given being in the hands of the usual staff. A Sunday School by outside volunteers might become an important means of help. The gift or loan of periodicals to be kept only for Sunday reading; an occasional lecture, or classes for hymn singing, might either or all be introduced with advantage.

As I write, many methods occur to me, too many to mention in detail, else I should weary you, but all helping either to bring the interest of outside life into the school, or else to separate and individualise each child from the mass. Little things, such as providing occupation in the receiving wards, if it be only knitting, unpicking, or rolling boot laces. Little things, such as giving the children scrap books, shells, and toys to amuse them during the long weary hours which have to be spent in the infirmary, all the more weary sometimes because the patient ‘only has bad feet or a sore head’; but better than either of these dumb companions would be the kindly afternoon caller, who would read or chat to the children.

Little alterations, such as calling the girls by their Christian names instead of by numbers, or Jones and Murphy, as is generally done. Little innovations like the keeping of animals, dogs, cats, and birds in their midst. How they love the beasts, these homeless ones! ‘We can’t keep the rats
down, the children will feed them so,' was a grumble I had once addressed to me; and if one takes them out into the country the first thing they seek is 'something to keep which will live.' Baroness Burdett Coutts and her prizes for essays against cruelty might be advantageously used here. Little things, such as allowing each child to choose which bit of poetry to learn, or making composition lessons a personal history of the past week.

Or bigger things, like fields for playing; swimming lessons both for boys and girls; a band; musical drill on cold days; kindergarten games for the infants, all of them would be of some influence, but perhaps the most influential method would be some kind of plan by which the children could rise in the school through classes, to be arranged according to moral character as well as to the school work, and embracing the industrial training throughout the establishment.

Each trade master or mistress would have to be responsible for the time during which the child was with him or her and would daily report concerning conduct, which would influence the position in the conduct class. The progress upwards could be shown by some little mark on the dress, blue or brown ribbons for the girls, sleeve strips for the boys. The highest class might be in close and intimate relation with the heads of the establishment, carrying their spirit through the school as nothing else could.

A few extra privileges might be given to the highest classes, such as gathering together once a fortnight or so for tea with the master and matron; walking out alone, or in twos and threes; sitting up rather later; or the permission to keep their things in the recreation room and use them after the younger ones had retired to bed.

Slight outward signs, but implying much, no less a thing than that the master and his pupils are working for one object, as master and pupil still, as man or woman and child still, but yet fellow-workers together, meeting difficulties in union and banishing from the school the 'Don't tell him,' 'He'll find you out' spirit, which slays alike both love and truth.
How much would the whole tone of these schools be improved if the managers would, both in choosing and in governing their officials, feel towards them a little more as fellow-workers in a cause in which all alike cannot fail to be interested. If they could meet them sometimes—all of them—in consultation for the good of the school. If they would assume that the officials felt the same care for the children, and the public good, which is the motive power of their own presence on the board. If, in short, the managers would trust and expect more, the spirit of trust filtering through the master, officers, servants into the school, would meet with response. We should no longer hear of school scandals which shock and wound us all. Managers, officers, servants would thus together seek and find methods of doing their work better. They would all unite to become as 'one that serveth' to 'the little child in our midst.'

Henrietta O. Barnett.
"VOX CLAMANTIS"

The world has been startled by learning some invisible facts. Each one of us may hold his own opinion as to the way in which those facts have been made known. We may question the wisdom of teaching evil to millions who knew it not in order to scatter the hundreds who have practised abnormal vice. But it is done. It can neither be undone nor modified. It is now the duty of citizens to consider the position, and decide what practical good is possible. The earnestness of men of ordinary morality has been quickened. Those who for years have worked in the cause of social purity have found a sympathetic audience. The ordinarily immoral man has been brought to face the ultimate results of courses similar to those which he is himself pursuing, and the latent sense of chivalry which he possesses has been roused by the knowledge of the cruelty of vice. The extraordinarily immoral man has been forced by the only sentiment which appeals to him—the sentiment of fear—to think whether publicity may not one day bring him to open shame. Women have been obliged to consider the sin and shame attending the lives of their fallen sisters and their own relation to the whole question.

For some time it has been a matter of disgrace and complaint that two moral standards exist in England, the one for men, the other for women. The average Englishman expects

1 Reprinted from *Time*, October 1885. A paper written after a popular outcry caused by the exposure of vice in an evening journal.
that the women with whom he is connected by ties of blood or service shall be pure. He is even shocked that the innocence of any with whom he is connected should run the risk of being tainted by philanthropic effort. But as regards his male relations he seems not to care one jot what their private life may be; he puts the question on one side with the remark that so-and-so 'is sowing his wild oats,' 'boys will be boys,' and the like.

This line of argument obviously ends in a dual standard of morality. Women must be pure, but men need not, so long as they avoid inconvenient scandal. To such an extent is this opinion carried, that in certain circles those who hold aloof from vicious courses are regarded as contemptible purists, something less than men. As one result of this dual standard, the following instance may be quoted. A lady for years had been interested in the rescue work carried on by a few of her friends. Her sons were of the type of ordinarily immoral men, but their immorality was concealed from all except from a few intimate friends. This lady was induced to visit a well-known place of amusement in order to bring away a girl who had once been persuaded to abandon her 'sad, mad, bad' life. During conversation the lady observed that the girl bestowed a friendly greeting on a young man, who, after passing, turned to look at the girl and the lady who were so earnestly talking. A look of mutual recognition followed. The mother recognised her son, whom she believed to be rowing down the Thames. This instance proves one point, that no permanent improvement is possible without a uniform standard. To frown on the sinners of one sex, and ignore the identical sins in the other, is as unfair as it is unprincipled. We are thus brought face to face with two alternatives; either the present standard for one sex is absurdly high, or for the other it is scandalously low. Either we must boldly advocate a return to social life of the Hetaira, or we must fix a social ban on immoral men.

The man of the world will probably answer that sins of impurity are less harmful to man's moral nature than to
woman's. But although this argument is frequently brought forward, it is difficult to see its logic. The law of purity is binding, because on it rests the home, and home life is the basis not only of society but of civilisation. Vice, whether in man or woman, whether published or concealed, breaks up homes. When a man once sins he regards all women and all home life with altered eyes; for him family life has lost its sanctity and charm; he can never again regard women as in the days of his innocence. For every man, whether controlled or licentious, woman is the ideal of purity. By helping to still further degrade a degraded woman he lowers his own ideal, and hence the whole current of his thoughts is vitiated. He regards all men and women through mud-coloured spectacles, and for him the world is fouled. It is no doubt less hard for a man to win back a character than for a woman, but this is only because the world is willing to forgive the sins in one sex, but not in the other. Theft, murder, lying are judged independently of sex; why should impurity be differently treated? In moral questions sex is an accident, not an essential: if the law of purity is binding on women, it is binding on men.

The physiological aspect of the question cannot be here discussed, but doctors do not hesitate to say that continence is not injurious to health, and one of the greatest physicians of our day has recently declared 'that marriage can safely be waited for.' There are many men, no doubt, who through weakness of will and carelessness of life have reduced themselves to the level of brutes; but we must also hear the evidence of those who have fought the good fight and have conquered. If men inflame their passions by overfeeding, by overdrinking, by brooding on subjects which tend to impurity, by giving up physical exercise when they most need it, they hand themselves over to a power which they will with difficulty master. But victory even by such men has been won, and will be won again. In this question early training goes for much; and until the teaching of physiology breaks down the policy of silence in our schools improvement is almost impos-
sible. Boys should be told the facts of their physical life and the conditions of their developing manhood by their fathers. If boys are to hear this question discussed solely by evil-livers, they will adopt the lower standard—a standard which only compares with the morality of the lower empire and the more profligate of Hellenic states. It has been necessary to enter into these details in order to meet the arguments of the ordinarily immoral man, though we feel an apology is due.

The first point on which social reformers should insist is an identical moral standard for men and women. Impure men must be shunned as are impure women. Their society must only be sought by those who would save them just as the society of impure women is sought. Otherwise we must look for an indefinite increase in the vicious, the ultimate recognition of the prostitute in Society and the degradation of family life.

In this matter decent living men and women can do much. They must not choose as friends, or admit on terms of social equality, men known from their behaviour, conversation, and tone to be leading bad lives: indeed, they must go further, and shun them, regardless of the world’s favour or their social position. What good woman would be bold enough to invite to her house a prostitute together with a general company of friends? In common justice, the same measure of social ostracism must be meted out to those whose money degrades womanhood, whose lusts blast women’s lives, because, forsooth, their wills are too weak and enervated to control controllable passions. In this matter let us have no mawkish sentimentality, either about the lost woman or the degraded man. Our present standard is wrong; it must be altered regardless of cost. A surgeon who spares the knife to save the patient passing pain is a coward in his heart and a traitor to his calling. For the good of men we must use the knife of sternness; for the good of women we must direct our thoughts and sympathy to the virgin saint, and not to the repentant Magdalen.

Some of those who feel that this vice is eating into the
heart of society have banded themselves into Vigilance Committees to thwart its progress. Their difficulty is where to begin, and what line of policy to pursue. The chief thing is to raise the moral standard—but of this enough has been said. The remarks which we have to offer may be divided under the following heads:—

I. As to the enforcement of the law. Those of experience know the difficulty of getting information when the law relating to children is broken in towns where neighbours are strangers. The Committee (consisting almost entirely of trustworthy workmen and women) should be in close communication with School Board visitors and industrial schools' officers, and should use their influence to get the number largely increased. For instance, in the East of London one visitor has charge of enforcing the law in a district reaching from Finsbury to Blackwall, from Upper Clapton to the Tower of London—a district which includes the Poor Law areas of Shoreditch, Whitechapel, Spitalfields, St. George in the East, Mile End, Stepney, Bethnal Green, Hoxton, Shadwell, Limehouse, Poplar, Ratcliffe, Bow, Bromley, and Dalston. This officer is expected to observe all the 'bad houses' in East London, and remove all children under the age of sixteen years found living in them. It not infrequently takes ten days to work up evidence on which magistrates will make the requisite order. If these Acts are to be enforced—and this is a policy of which all reasonable people approve—not only must the number of officers be increased, but their efforts will have to be supplemented by voluntary help.

II. As to the suppression of houses of ill-fame. On the whole, it is expedient that they should be closed, and pressure should be brought to bear on local authorities to put into operation the power which they already possess. It is urged that the suppression of these places will tend to the greater degradation of the sinners of both sexes, and that to avoid this result such resorts must be tolerated if quietly conducted. But no pity for the sinner should blind us to the nature of the sin. Sin is, in itself, degradation, and no surroundings
can make it less or more so. Indeed, if the surroundings are softened, it only tends to make it more dangerous because less repulsive. Such houses should be closed, because men often fall into sin when the means are at hand. It is corrupting for the children of honest people to be brought within sight and sound of these houses. Young men and women are demoralised by familiarity with vice, and by degrees they adopt the opinion of the man of the world, that vice is not degradation. They learn, too, the methods by which the idle can get a livelihood without honest work. Before such a house is closed, every care should of course be taken to remove the children to industrial schools.

III. The police must be helped to do their duty. There is cause to complain of the moral tone of the force. The men are bound by stringent rules which can be easily broken in ways where detection is difficult. But it must not be forgotten that in the matter of moral education they are a neglected body. Publicans, shop-keepers, street-sellers, &c., combine to lower their moral standard by offering bribes for neglect of duty; and there are but few agencies on the other side except official inspection. The police might become moral agents of the first importance, if imbued with a truer sense of duty. To under-paid men bribes in money or kind are serious temptations. But as long as the British public care more for money-getting than for righteousness little will be done. It is no doubt of importance that Vigilance Committees should keep on good terms with the police for the enforcement of existing law. But it must be clearly understood that they are prepared to do unpleasant work in order to raise the tone of the force.

IV. Vigilance Committees should make known methods for the attainment of personal purity, and the Central Association should issue leaflets dealing with this matter from a scientific standpoint. They should be prepared to institute a course of scientific lectures on physiology wherever a class of men or women could be gathered. They should be prepared with lists of houses where those desirous of abandoning a vicious life
might be at once received. They should take the necessary steps for the suppression of corrupting literature. In short, they should seek to arouse by every means the true spirit of democratic chivalry. Men must be made to understand that because women are more self-sacrificing, therefore they are to be guarded by men, and that to debase women for the gratification of conquerable lust is the work of a coward and a knave. On this matter all classes are equally to blame — selfishness and vileness are not the distinctive marks of either the rich man or the poor; the common talk of the workshop is no better than that of the club where fast men congregate — all classes are tarred with the same brush, and all classes must unite to remove the blot.

Besides all this, Vigilance Committees vigorously worked might by degrees reform the laws bearing on the question. Laws could be devised so as to compel the patients in the lock wards of pauper or charitable asylums to remain under control long enough to shake off the chains of habitual sin and learn means of getting an honest livelihood. Vigilance Committees vigorously worked in combination might in time become a power felt by the nation and its rulers, a power which might make for righteousness.

So much can men do when banded together as committees or associations for the suppression of vice, but they can do more as individuals. To their younger relations (battling with desires strengthened by ignorance), amid the temptations of the workshop or large public school, they can speak of these things, pointing out not only the duty of self-restraint, but the holiness of the act when used as a sacrament and as a means of creation. Men often cannot resist tempting side-paths unless the main road is made clear by the light of an ideal. As individuals, men can seek out the society of those youths who, fresh from the country, are yearly thrown into our great cities, with innocence as their only safeguard. They can let them come to their own homes, introduce them to their wives or sisters, and tolerate their dulness in the hope of saving them from sin.
Men, too, can often do what women cannot for the saving of the fallen. The present writer can tell of an American who came to England on urgent business from a Friday to a Monday only. On the Friday he went to the play, and as he left the theatre he was accosted by one of those for whom all should sorrow. He replied, and speaking earnestly, gave her money to save her from sin that night, and asked her to meet him the following morning.

This she did, when he took her with him to St. Paul’s, Westminster Abbey, and other sights such as Americans love in order to give her ‘some sense of self-respect, and belief in the possible chivalry of men.’ On his return to his hotel, he could think of no better way of helping the woman than that of placing her under one of the ‘Guardians of the Poor,’ whose title, he thought, expressed their vocation. He found in the Directory the address of one of the chairmen, and, applying personally, was referred to the vicar of a large parish, whose wife was able to receive the young woman and place her where she could regain her character. In this she steadily persevered, and is now an honest working woman.

In such ways individual men, anxious that our nation should be pure, could work for that end. It costs something to show disapproval of conversation in railway carriages, club smoking rooms, or workshops, and perhaps something more to take solemnly to task those who offend; but those who have paid the cost can testify to the support they get from unexpected quarters, and the help that such talks have been to those who were beginning to think that the low, coarse standard in this matter is the only standard possible.

As individuals, men can do much, especially if they guard their own minds from the familiarity which much brooding on this vice ensures—familiarity which, even in the purest minds, must breed a certain want of delicate perception.

And how can women stem these evils? Their first duty is to get the system of education for girls radically reformed. If in the future women are to take their proper place in the development of the race, men ‘must find in them not merely
comfort, but force, inspiration, the redoubling of moral and intellectual faculties. Long prejudice, inferior education, political and legal inferiority and injustice, have created a difference which has been converted into an argument for still farther repression. In the sight of God there is neither man nor woman, only the human being.' The Mosaic story declared that God created man, and woman from man. The voice of the future will declare the further truth, that 'God created humanity made manifest in the woman and the man.' 'Woman,' said Kant, 'must be taught never to allow her humanity to be used as a means to an end. Woman is an end in herself.' 'Women should not demand their emancipation as a right, but must make men recognise as a duty the raising of womanhood.'

Woman's education must deal with truer ideas of marriage. Among some savages marriage is as rude and brutal as possible. As we rise in the scale of life it takes a purer form, and towards the summit of life it is a sacrament, the most awful sacrament that can ever be taken, and most certain, if taken unworthily, to bring damnation. Men and women must be taught that the truest wedded life can only come out of the truest unwedded life. It is folly to imagine that a woman who has had half-a-dozen 'affairs of the heart' can wed a man who has 'sown his wild oats,' and make a happy match. Purity and truth in deed, and thought, and word are imperative, not only towards one another, but towards their own most intimate life. Women must be taught that marriage is the greatest sacrament which they can take; and this, as wives and mothers, they must teach men.

But besides all this, women can do more. They can help working women to form leagues and trades unions, for it is undoubtedly poverty which in some cases makes women so fatally ready to yield to the tempter's money, though it is blasphemy to say that under-paid needlewomen habitually degrade their womanhood to eke out miserable earnings. Working women must combine, as men have done, to secure a reasonable share in profits. Married women must learn
the certain effects on their children, their husbands, and on
the wage-earning prospects of their sex of their selfishness in
continuing to work after marriage. Women must be taught
that their first and paramount duty is to make the home, not
to earn the wages wherewith to keep the home.

Women with education and sympathy can gather together
groups of working women in their workshops and clubs, or
attend mothers’ meetings, and, either collectively or in-
dividually, talk to the mothers or their daughters’ training,
their own duties towards them, and the reasons for plain
speaking at critical times. And if ladies who desire the pro-
gress of the nation would give up some of the claims of
society to perform their own functions as women their words
would come with the force gathered by example.

There is, moreover, great need of an association for shop
girls on the same lines as those adopted by the Metropolitan
Association for Befriending Young Servants. All young
women of the less educated classes require the guiding hand
of those who, knowing life, can warn some of its dangers and
guide all to its manifold good. Women can become the
friends of their own servants, and of their servants’ friends,
including the lover and the follower. By such friendship
some domestic tragedies, which become sources of national
disgrace, would be prevented; and, having done this, they
might extend their friendship to the many homeless and un-
protected girls who yearly find their way by hundreds into
the great market of domestic service. It is astonishing what
friendship can do to prevent vice, and this is more truly
women’s work than to rescue the vicious. In a letter which
appeared in the ‘Daily News’ on September 12, an account is
given of the work done by one of the branch committees of
the Metropolitan Association. It is stated that out of girls
who have in the last seven years come under the care of
the society, only 4 per cent. have gone astray, and not one
who ‘has had the helpful influence of a real friend.’ The
girls of this Association belong to the poorer class of East
Londoners, and many of them come from single-roomsed
homes. The world talks as though virtue depended for its existence on harmonious environment. Here at any rate is a proof that virtue is not that exclusive property of the well-to-do which some would have us believe.

Women can also become playmates to the playless. The whole question of recreation is closely connected with that of social purity, and the exact form must be carefully devised to suit those of active or sedentary pursuits, of both sexes and of all ages. It must be provided as a religious duty for children, as well as for young men and women, to save them as much as possible from the contaminating influence of the streets. Playrooms for children, clubs, gymnásia, swimming baths, must be supplied—if need be, at the cost of the State—if the nation is really anxious to stop the causes which make men and women profligate and uncontrolled.

In all these ways women can help to purify the world, and although what they can do for their own sex has hitherto only been dealt with, they can perhaps do still more for men. It has been said that it is a sign of men’s love of virtue that women of certain classes do not fall, and that it is a sign of the women’s indifference to virtue that the men in the same classes so frequently fall. This is a hard saying, but it contains some truth. Men of ordinary morality of the middle and upper classes will not take a fallen woman as a wife, but women of the same classes do not make the same demand of those men whom they take as their husbands. Men, therefore, adopt the standard which women have made for them, and it has hitherto been low. But women can yet raise that standard higher, and by adhering to it individually and collectively they can do more than can be done by any agencies and associations to raise the moral tone. Let a woman not be content to be in ignorance of the manner of man whom she meets as an acquaintance, but let her make it her duty to inquire of her husband and brother of the man’s private life, and let the bad be mercilessly ostracised. If it is objected that such action would condemn men only to the society of the vicious, it must be remembered men have a free choice,
and that for the good of the whole the lives of those who
choose vice must be made unattractive and undesirable. This
would not prevent woman gifted with the power of personal
influence from seeing such men, but they would then do so as
philanthropists, and not as social equals.

Women can also do much by making friends of young
men; they need not talk with them on this matter, and, in-
deed, except in rare cases, such matters are better left undisc-
cussed. But striking results would follow if women would
allow themselves to be the friends of young men, entering
into their amusements, hopes, and pleasures. Such a woman
is known to the writer, who, herself confined for years to her
invalid couch, has guided and influenced the lives of countless
boys and young men; so many that, though she uses few
other means than the simple method of caring for them, she
herself will feel surprise when, in the far unknown future, she
sees the many who can arise and call her blessed.

All women with homes of their own can do this sort of
work, but perhaps it is specially given to those whose husbands
are connected with large firms; for to these the introductions
to men who more immediately need lady friends can come
about in the most simple way. The young clerk, the lad
freshly introduced into the business, can unaffectedly be in-
vited to the elder man's house, and in the woman's hand is
placed the rest. Often a man who has been blessed with
such a friendship can affirm that it has altered his whole life.

Sometimes, too, a woman can influence her own brothers
and relations even more directly. She can speak to them on
these subjects as a woman's natural purity suggests, pointing
out the high possibility of the relation of the sexes, and
illustrating the lofty courtesy between man and woman, which
alone paves the way for the right understanding of the highest
power which is given unto man—the power wherein he most
resembles God.

Manifold, then, are the opportunities which all possess of
doing some work on behalf of purity.
To have struck some blow for right with tongue or pen,
To have smoothed the path to light for wandering men

A little backward to have thrust
The instant powers of drink and lust,

will make a noble retrospect for a well-spent life. Righteousness alone exalteth nations. On this battle for purity hangs the future of England, and perhaps the destiny of the world. 'Tremble, ye women that are at ease; be troubled, ye careless ones; gird sackcloth upon your loins—rise up: hear my voice; give ear unto my speech, ye careless daughters of God.'

HENRIETTA O. BARNETT.
THE YOUNG WOMEN IN OUR WORKHOUSES

Those of us who have ever entered a workhouse will not easily forget some of the sad impressions then made upon the mind. We remember the large dreary wards—

The walls so blank
That my shadow I thank
For sometimes falling there—

the cleanliness which is oppressive, the order which tells of control in every detail. But, gloomy as these things are, they are but the necessary surroundings of many of the people who come to end their days amid them. On their faces is written failure; having been proved useless to the world, they are cast away out of sight, and too often out of mind, on to this sad rubbish-heap of humanity.

A closer inspection of this rubbish-heap, however, shows that it is not all worthless. Besides the many whom dissolute, improvident, or vicious courses bring to the workhouse, there are some who are more sinned against than sinful; some who are merely unfortunate, and who by a little wise help, wisely given, may become useful members of society.

It is of the young, single women that I would specially speak. Those whom one finds in the workhouse are usually there for one of three reasons. Firstly, in order to seek shelter when about to become mothers; secondly, because they are driven thither by the evil results of profligacy; thirdly, because

1 Reprinted, by permission, from *Macmillan’s Magazine*, August 1879.
having failed in life they choose to enter there rather than to sin or to starve. It is of the first and third classes that I now write, for the second class is being dealt with, if not efficiently at least earnestly, by many societies founded for that purpose.

From June 1877 to June 1878 in the seven unions of East London alone there have been no less than 253 young girls—mothers who have entered the infirmaries.

Some enter a few months before their confinement, driven to that inhospitable shelter from the sense of the value of their remaining character. And here a word is required as to the neglect of any proper method of classification. There should be in all our workhouses accommodation which would allow of the separation of characters among classes; and power and encouragement should be given to the master and matron to carry this plan into effectual working. The more respectable of the young women might be placed under the supervision of one of the staff, so that the time which necessarily elapses before they can be again sent out should be to them a time of instruction in what is good and desirable, instead of, as it now too often is, a time when they are corrupted by the evil influence of others worse than themselves.

But these 253—what becomes of them? On their recovery they cannot remain in the infirmary, and must be sent to the able-bodied house, there to live on prison fare and to associate with the criminal and wilfully idle. Rather than do this many a young woman prefers to go out, taking her three-weeks-old babe with her, resolved to 'get on' as best she can. That 'best' is often the 'worst.' With her character gone, with two mouths to feed instead of one, and with the loss of self-respect rapidly following the loss of the respect of others, the unfortunate mother too often falls into hopeless vice; or, perhaps, the giant temptation presents itself of sacrificing the little wailing life which stands between her and respectability. Unhelped, unencouraged as they are, who can wonder that such mothers, so sorely tried, sometimes fall, and that the crime of infanticide is too common?

But frequent as such results are, the end is not always
thus tragic; the ruined girl often returns to her father’s house and to the same conditions of life as before she fell. But this course, though not so apparently bad, is yet often very harmful. Her presence familiarizes the younger members with vice, an unadvisable familiarity; for vice, while it gains much attractive power, gains also more deterrent force by its mystery in the minds of the young.

Sometimes the unwedded mother, on leaving the workhouse, honestly tries to get work at sack-making, factory-work, anything which will enable her to keep her little one near her; but it is a hard, and an almost impossible, task. The care of the child impedes the work, and thus it has to be put out to daily nurse. The ignorance, if not the apathy, of its badly-paid nurse and the unsuitability of its food too often combine to extinguish the little flame which was burning to guide its mother back to virtue by the paths of love and self-control.

These, briefly, are some of the present evils which beset the lives of the young women who become mothers in our workhouses.

It was to cure some of such evils that a few ladies associated themselves together in the spring of 1876. We bound ourselves by no rules or bye-laws, for the work is one which is entirely of an individual nature. Strong personal influence has to be brought to bear on each applicant, with a distinct and definite object in view, suggested by the character of the woman and the circumstances of the case. There have been, unfortunately, changes in our workers, but we have continued to visit, with fair regularity, both the infirmary and the able-bodied house of our Union. When work is necessarily left so largely to individual initiative, depending on the character of the worker, each lady must, naturally, adopt her own method of doing it. Some feel that they can do more for the girls by changing the circumstances of their lives, while others can do more with them by arousing their dormant moral natures and filling them with enthusiasm for good. But all ways of doing the work are needed, the more diverse the means the larger the number of women likely to be reached.
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The very diversity of the means makes it difficult, however, to write about the work as it is done by all the co-operators. It is, therefore, well that I should speak only of my own plan and experiences.

I visit about once a week, and see alone in a room, which the matron kindly lends for the purpose, each girl who has expressed a wish to lead a good life. After talking to her and learning of her antecedents, her statements are sent to the Charity Organisation Society to be verified. I try to learn something of her character, of the ideal she has of her own life, of the plans she has made for the future, of the kind and manner of good which appears to her most attractive and desirable. On receipt of the Report of the Charity Organisation Society each girl is dealt with in accordance with her past life; she who has suffered from the allurements and excitements of the town is sent into the country, being placed where the monotony and peace will protect her from herself; she who has for long lived a lawless and undisciplined life is induced to enter a Home of Refuge, where order and control will teach her the unlearnt lessons; while sometimes it is possible to get for her for whom drink has been too strong a situation with a teetotal family, who will help her by example as well as principle. For the woman whose maternal feeling wants frequent contact with her child to invigorate it, a place is got where the mistress, knowing all the facts, will allow her servant often to see the little one; while the mother, whose sense of shame is stronger than her love for the child, is sent to a place far removed from the caretaker of her baby, in the trust that the money which she weekly sends for it will keep in remembrance the sin of which she has been guilty and the innocent result of it.

It is a common idea that the only way of helping women sunk so low as these is to send them to Homes. This idea I would like to modify. Homes are very valuable in giving girls the opportunities of re-earning a character when, as they themselves say, they have ‘no one to speak for them.’ Still, in all these cases where the fault which brought them to the work-
house (serious as it may be) has not undermined the whole character, it is perhaps better to send them at once to service. In their mistresses’ houses they are, unconsciously, guarded from the grosser temptations which lone girls have to meet, being guided by influence rather than rule. The regular, if at times too hard, work of service demanded by the varying interests and needs of a family is the greatest help to a healthy tone of mind. In a good home they see family life in all its strength, they see the commonplace virtues in a beautiful and attractive setting, and the kindliness which is engendered between the served and the server helps the poor stumbling soul along the path of duty over many a rough and difficult place. ‘Oh! ma’am,’ a girl said the other day, ‘the missus’s baby is such a dear; he do make me forget such a lot;’ a forgetfulness which was in her case the first necessary step towards a fairer future.

It is a good rule to tell every circumstance, however trivial, to the mistress, so that she can become in her turn the guardian of her servant against the besetting sin; and all honour be to those many ladies who have so generously come forward to take these girls into their own homes, sometimes giving them more wages than their services warranted, often helping them with clothes both for themselves and their children, and giving them too that priceless sympathy which outweighs every other gift. Such help saves more pain and makes more righteousness than big, barren subscriptions to far-off institutions; for

The gift without the giver is bare.

If the girl has been a servant before, she can obtain 15l. or 16l. a year: out of this she can pay 4s. or 4s. 6d. a week, and her lady friend can assist her by paying 1s. or 6d. a week towards her baby’s support. If the girl has never been a servant, it is necessary that she should enter service at a much lower wage. She must then get more money assistance, the sum being decided by the rough estimate that she should pay two-thirds of her money, whatever it is.
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The small payment has many advantages; it enables the mother to disassociate herself from her past corrupt association; it assists her lady friend to keep up constant communication with her, whereby she is enabled to advise about her future, her change of place, her friends; and it also enables a watchful eye to be kept on the little one. Its nurse coming weekly to receive the money can tell of its progress, the lady can see if it is well cared for, and can by her interest encourage the nurse to do her best. As a rule the caretakers become very fond of their little charges. In one instance, the mother having, alas! again returned to evil ways, the nurse continued to keep the baby without payment, jealously guarding him against his mother, 'who might harm him when in drink.' Another woman came to ask for a nurse-child because, she said, she had had fourteen children of her own, and now that they were all out in the world, 'her old man said it was so lonesome-like.' It is important, too, to choose the nurse carefully, for she has frequently a great influence on the mother, who will naturally be more inclined to listen to the wise words of one who is 'good to her baby' than to any mere well-wisher. The mother by this means gains a respectable friend of her own class, in many cases the first she has ever known. In one instance the nurse did what others had failed to do. The mother was one of those people to whom pleasure is as necessary as food and air. Among happier surroundings her sense of fun and capacity for enjoyment would have been a source of brightness, and rendered her a general favourite. For those in her sphere of life joy is an element considered unnecessary, and thus is a dangerous luxury. She had no desire to do wrong nor to offend, but pleasure she must have, and not being able to obtain it innocently she took it lawlessly. Such conduct mistresses rightly would not allow, and she reached the workhouse when her boy was about three years old. There seemed to be no trace of affection for the child, nor any feeling beyond a sense of irritation at its helplessness and a desire to get it 'into a home,' and to be rid of the attendant responsibility. This last idea it was impossible to
entertain, for responsibility might become her schoolmaster, and lead her up 'the difficult blue heights.'

She was a thorough general servant; hence there was little difficulty in getting her into a place. A home for the boy was found, with a most demonstrative and affectionate nurse, who rarely spoke of him except as a 'pretty lamb,' and who loudly and frequently called on all to admire him. Little by little this influenced the young mother, who began to be interested in the much-talked-of and cared-for baby. The deducted wages were more cheerfully rendered for its support, and as love obtained admittance to her heart, and all the many cares which accompanied a child brought interest into her life, there became less need for the outside pleasures. The craving for enjoyment found satisfaction in giving joys to the baby boy.

It would be easy to give many instances of the success of this work, but one or two will suffice. Jane, a motherless girl of sixteen, brought up in a rough, low-class home, and sent to earn her bread before she could well distinguish good from evil—what wonder that she came into the only asylum open to her, harmed by the first man who had ever shown her a kindness? She appeared indifferent to her fate, but she showed such passionate and self-giving devotion to the child that it seemed possible that her character would be awakened by her maternal feelings. They were accordingly placed in a house where they could be together; the child soon died, and Jane having greatly improved, she was sent to a situation, where she is doing well, and has got again some of the brightness of youth.

Emma, a woman of twenty-six, had for some years lived abroad with a man who promised her 'English marriage,' but who, on reaching England, basely deserted her. Characterless and unknown as she was, she tried in vain to get work to support herself and child; and at last, half dead with privation, she entered the 'House.' She had not a reference to give, nor a friend to apply to, but she did so thoroughly and well the work which the matron gave her, and so earnestly pleaded to have a trial, that, trusting in my opinion of her
rity, a good woman in the country took her as a servant, now, after two years of trial, writes to ask that other serv-
may be sent to her 'as good as Emma.' Her boy is
in a village a few miles off, and all the holidays, most
money, and many of the spare moments are given to
in whom is treasured the one bright memory of her
past.
out of each girl that is helped such pleasant stories cannot
ld. There are many failures: women whose resolution
st them before the old temptations, whose promises are
ightly broken as they were earnestly made; girls whose ill
anions offer them bright if lawless lives, and who leave
ew hard ways for the well-known aimless, careless life.
put, in spite of many failures, the work is hopefully con-
d in the belief, founded on experience, that the idle can
duced to work and learn through daily labour the gospel
work teaches; that the coarse-minded can yet see the
ity of holiness if it is shown greatly and plainly; that the
ant can yet be taught if patience be given; that the
ess may yet be circumvent if cared for. Failures and
points are inevitable when the aim is not to make a
orary improvement, but to raise the ideas and radically
ge the habits of a class to help whom there has hitherto
so little effort made.
but there is yet the third class of girls who have been cast
wave of misfortune into the workhouse. These are not
ed by the societies for befriending young servants, for
y have never been servants, and some have started on their
before the societies were formed. Some come in because
parents break up their homes and altogether 'enter the
se.' In such a plight was poor Martha, a sickly girl of
een, too crippled to be fit for manual work. Her father
ed; her mother was so drunken that the workhouse was
er the only resort; and thither she came bringing her
ren with her, and among them the poor weak Martha. The
children were sent to the district schools, but the cripple
too old to go there. There was nothing for her but to
drag on a loveless, cheerless life and make her home in that unhomely place. She was a bright willing lassie, but her labour, such as it was, was not needed there, where she was but one of the many useless ones who help to give trouble and swell the rates. She was deft with her fingers and capable, if not of entirely supporting herself, still of adding wealth to the world by her work. A home was soon found for her where she could be taught straw-basket work, and on drawing the attention of the Guardians to her case they at once consented to pay for the training. We occasionally see her. She has been taught to read and write, and to make bonnets and baskets quickly and well. She is very happy, and, though sighing when speaking of the workhouse, she adds in the same breath, 'The matron was real good to me there.'

Some seek the workhouse because, having lost their places and being alone in the world, they know not where else to go. Some having drifted there more than once arouse the contempt and antagonism of the officers; and these, unloving and indifferent because unloved, lose all hope and interest, and grow stubborn and hard. To these girls the lady must show herself their friend, and awaken their interest in life. One girl was sent to me, not yet twenty-one, who had passed through innumerable situations, who had been for six years in and out of the House continually, and who had once been sent to prison for a breach of the necessary discipline. She was pronounced 'incorrigible' by the authorities. I confess to having felt powerless to work her reformation when I saw her. Her stubborn set face, her downcast dull eyes, her stolid refusal to speak in reply to whatever was said, her apathy on all subjects made me feel that I had not a chance of touching her. I tried all ways, but at last aroused her by asking her to do something for me. The God-born sense of helpfulness in her awoke her sleeping soul. She felt she cared for the one person in all the world whom she had ever helped, and that affection has been her 'saving grace.' She is now earning £2 a year, more, as she says, than she had 'earned in two years afore,' and her face, manners, and character are rapidly
improving. She comes to me to help her to choose her new clothes, and I could not but be satisfactorily amused when the 'incorrigible' pauper insisted on having a 'high art' coloured dress, declaring that none of the others suggested were 'half so pretty.' Many such stories could be told, many beginning brightly and ending sadly, some turning out better than their commencement would have justified us in hoping. One poor child, motherless and worse than fatherless, after a short training in a Home, is now in service and paying towards the support of her younger sister; another has a conscience so awakened as to make her hesitate for long as to her right to be confirmed because of the sin ignorantly committed which brought her to the rates; while tales could be told of women, rough and untutored, who have joyfully taken the hard, self-restraining path which leads to righteousness, and who, having once been given great ideals, receive them as new truths and patiently (pathetically so among their rude surroundings) endeavour to live up to them.

Enough may have been said to induce other ladies to adopt the work. Taking the figures of the last two years' work at one workhouse, we have seen 141 women. Of these we have sent out, to service or to work, ninety-five; and out of these only five have again returned to the workhouse. Of many we have lost sight, which is not to be wondered at when the ignorance of the women of this class is considered. A letter is to them a thing to be much pondered, but rarely attempted. Some, after long silences, reappear to ask advice in some temporary difficulty, or to tell of progress made. Many remain close friends, coming to call on every holiday or writing long and affectionate letters. One wrote the other day a stilted letter of thanks, 'for having altered her position in the world for one of more sterling worth.' Her future did look gloomy when first we became acquainted. She was the daughter of a sea-side lodging-house keeper, brought up in a cheap (and nasty) boarding-school, and sent to London, with many false ideas about work and some true ones about wickedness, to earn her living in any 'genteel' employment. Her
superficial education did not help her, and she came down lower and lower, till at last, finding herself in a lodging-house of doubtful reputation, she rightly chose the workhouse in preference to remaining there. Her widowed mother, unable to keep her, and fearful that her frivolities would influence badly her younger sisters, refused to receive her home. Her fine ladyism and ignorance of any sort of household work were an effectual barrier to her taking service, while her sorry education prevented her even trying to teach. Service seemed to be the best opening for her, and the life best calculated to keep her straight. With some difficulty she was persuaded to look at it in this light, and then induced to enter a servants' training home. She has earned good testimonials there, and is now a happy and useful servant.

The work is in itself simple, and yet has issues important, not only to the individuals helped, but to the community at large, for it tends to lessen pauperism, prostitution, and infanticide. It would be well if every lady of England were to consider how she can take part in it. If she is not herself able to visit the workhouse, she can, perhaps open her house and heart to one of these girls who so sadly need such protection and care; or, if that be impossible, she might undertake to befriend one of them.

Around every workhouse a committee of ladies might be formed. The meetings need not, perhaps, be formal nor frequent, but merely friendly gatherings to compare experience and to discuss reports of the work done. The visiting of the workhouse is, perhaps, for reasons which will be appreciated by those who are familiar with official establishments, better left to two or three of the members who, after seeing the girls and learning their histories, should pass one or more to each member of the committee to provide for. Every lady might be a member of such a committee. Every woman can befriend another, and perhaps may be the more moved to do so when she who needs the help is a girl no older than her own daughter in the schoolroom. There are few who cannot help the work of such committees by contributing
1s. a week for the helping of one little baby. Everyone can spare a little of that loving care, can give a little of that all-saving friendship which so lavishly surrounds the life of most of us.

The work, too, is one which married ladies with homes, families, and social duties can easily take up. Women in this position are debarred from much work for the poor, because their natural and more sacred duties forbid them to run risks of infection, or to take up work which would necessitate the devoting of a regular fixed day. But from both these disadvantages the work now under consideration is quite free. In the workhouse the visitor is safe from infection; the visits can be made at any time, for the women are always there, and there is always somebody waiting to be helped whenever one can go. It is, of course, better to fix a regular day for visiting if possible, so that those girls who have been seen once may be able to anticipate the second visit; but this is not at all essential, and frequently the duties of a mother or mistress do not permit of long absences from home. This work, excepting the periodical visit to the workhouse, can be done almost entirely from the writing-table in one's house. It necessitates a good deal of correspondence in order to insure obtaining suitable situations and respectable nurses; but it requires comparatively little absence from home, for when the girl is once placed, the friendly connection can best be established and kept up in the lady's own house. There she can receive her otherwise friendless visitor; there she can strengthen the gentle bonds already begun in the house; there she can show to the homeless one some of the possibilities of home, and by such simply natural acts sow seed which will bring forth much good and happiness.

It is entirely a personal work done in the home, and in the interests of the individual and of the family; one full of elements of difficulty, and frequently of disappointment and failure. It requires no costly machinery; wherever there is one woman who cares for other women; wherever
there is a home full of the joys of family life; wherever two or three can meet together in common work, there is all the force that is required. If in every Union and all its parishes, or even in many Unions and some of their parishes, those who think that what has been done by a few working together is useful, if these will take up their part of the burden as it lies near their door, the work may grow. If it grow naturally and by no enforced development, its results may be larger than can yet be foreseen. New thought may develop new plans, wider interest may bring wider change. Our workhouses may become the means of restoring to joy and self-respect many who now leave their walls sad and degraded. Society may be strengthened by the new link between the envied rich and the unknown pauper, a link of unassailable strength being formed of love and service. And if none of these things come to pass, the effort must still be good which rouses into action a part of that family life which in its rest is so beautiful.

Henrietta O. Barnett.
'AT HOME' TO THE POOR

Few people realise the extreme dulness of the lives of the poor. Cut off from the many interests which education or the possession of money gives, they have little left but the 'trivial round, the common task,' which indeed furnishes them with 'room to deny themselves,' but is hardly, in their case at least, 'the road to bring them daily nearer God.'

'People must be amuthed,' is the caricatured statement of a true human need, and the terrible and often deplored attraction of the public-house has its root not so much in the love of strong drink as in the want of interest and desire for amusement felt by the lower classes of the poor. This is especially true with regard to the women and to those men who cannot read. Unable to comprehend the ever-living interest of watching public affairs, prevented by ignorance from following, even in outline, the actions of the nations, they are thrown back on the affairs of their neighbours, and centre all their interest in the sayings and doings of quarrelsome Mr. Jones or much-abused Mrs. Smith.

It is difficult for those of us to whom the world seems almost too full of interests to realise the deadening dulness of some of these lives. Let us imagine, for an instant, all knowledge of history, geography, art, science, and language blotted out; all interests in politics, social movements, and discoveries obliterated; no society pleasures to anticipate; no trials of skill nor tests of proficiency in work or play

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Cornhill Magazine of May 1881.
to look forward to; no money at command to enable us to plan some pleasure for a friend or dependent; no books always at hand, the old friends waiting silently till their acquaintance is renewed, the new ones standing ready to be learnt and loved; no opportunities of getting change of scene and idea; no memories laden with pleasures of travel; no objects of real beauty to look at. What would our lives become? And yet this is a true picture of the lives of thousands of the poorer classes, whose time is passed in hard, monotonous work or occupied in the petty cares of many children, and in satisfying the sordid wants of the body. In some cases precarious labour adds the element of uncertainty to the other troubles—an element which, by the fact of its bringing some interest, is enjoyed by the men, but adds tenfold to the many cares of the housewife.

It is not easy to see how the poor themselves can get out of this atmosphere of dulness. They can hardly give parties, even if the cost of entertaining were not a sufficient barrier; the extreme smallness of the rooms entirely prevents social intercourse, not to mention the hindrances caused by the necessity for putting the children to bed in the course of the evening, and by all the many discomforts consequent on the one room being bedroom, parlour, kitchen, and scullery. But, even supposing there are two rooms or few children, the difficulties of entertaining are not yet over. With minds so barren, conversation can hardly be the source of much amusement, and music and dancing are almost impossible with no instrument to help, and no space where even the little feet can patter.

But it is possible for the ignorant as well as the cultured to enjoy Nature. And it is often a subject of wonder why the poor, living in such close streets or alleys, surrounded with such unlovely objects, do not take more trouble to get out into the country or enjoy the parks. 'Only sixpence, you say,' said a hard-working, pale body to me one day when I was urging her to go on one of her enforced idle afternoons to get air and see some refreshing beauty at Hampstead. 'Well,
yer see, I could hardly go without the three children, and that's 1s. 3d.; besides, they'd be a deal hungrier when they came home than perhaps I could manage for.

What could be said to the last argument? Just fancy having to consider, otherwise than pleasurably, the increased appetite of one of our young ones fresh from a day by the sea or in the country.

But, apart from the money question, the desire to go into the country after a time wears off, even among those who have before lived in pure air and among country sights and scenes; people get used to their dull, sordid surroundings; the memory of fairer sights grows dim, and the imagination is not strong enough to conjure them up again.

'Shure, I ain't been in the country this fifteen year,' an old woman once startled me by saying at a country party; 'and if it hadn't been for your note 'ere it would ha' been another fifteen year afore I'd ha' seen it.'

And she was not so poor, this old lady; 7s. a week, perhaps, and 2s. 6d. to pay for rent. It was not her poverty which prevented her seeing the fifteen fair springs which had passed since she came from the Green Isle. No! it was just the want of power to make the effort—a loss to her far more serious than the loss of the sight of the country. As the late James Hinton used to say, 'The worst thing is to be in hell and not know it is hell'; perhaps the best thing one can do for another is to give him the glimpse of heaven, which letting in the light, shows the blackness of hell.

'Don't you think green is God's favourite colour?' asked an old lady, the thought being suggested as we stood together in a forest of soft green. 'Well, I can't say,' was the answer; 'look at the sky; how blue that is.' 'Yes, but that isn't always blue, and the earth is 'most always green.'

Does it not seem a pity that this old poet soul, so fit to teach God's lessons, should live all through the summer days in one room, shared by four other people, seeing only the mud colours of London, which certainly are not God's favourite colours? It was this same old lady who said, on receiving
her first invitation, 'All the years I've lived in London I was never asked to go into the country before you asked me.'

But the want of pleasure and change is no newly-discovered need of the poor. School-treats and excursions and bean-feasts have been organised and carried out almost since Sunday-schools have existed and congregations had a corporate life. Every summer sees the columns of the newspapers used to ask for money to give 900, 1,000, 2,000 children 'one day in the country,' and when the money is obtained and the day arrives, the children are packed into vans or a special train and turned into the woods or fields to enjoy themselves (and tease the frogs) until tea, buns, and hymns bring the 'appy day' to an end. Good days these, full of pleasure and health-giving exercise, but perhaps mixed with too large an element of excitement to teach the children to enjoy the country for its own sake, to enable them to learn in Dame Nature's lap 'that we can feed this mind of ours in a wise passiveness.'

Neither have the clergy overlooked this need as existing among their own people, and most of those working in poor neighbourhoods organise an annual 'Treat,' each person paying, say, 1s., to be met by the 6d. from the Pastor's Fund. These treats sometimes assume the enormous proportions of 2,000 or 3,000 persons. All carry their mid-day meal to be eaten when and how they like. The assembling for tea and a few speeches by the rector and those in authority are the only means taken to bring the people together and to introduce the sense of host and guest. And with the memory of the 1s. paid, this sense is very difficult either to arouse or maintain. But, good as in many ways these treats are, they do not do all they might. They do not introduce fresh experiences, an acquaintance with other lives, the interest of new knowledge.

We receive but what we give,
And in our life alone does nature live,

as Coleridge puts it; and such sadly empty minds want the
interpretation of the friendly eye to make them see what they went out 'for to see.'

Struck with these ideas, we determined to try another method of entertaining our neighbours; and believing that they had the same need of social intercourse as that felt by the rich, and taking for granted that the kind of country entertainment most prevalent among the rich was that most enjoyed, we based our parties on the same foundation, remembering always that the minds of the poor being emptier, more active entertainment was needed, and that the party to which we invited them was perhaps the one day's outing in the whole year, the one glimpse that they had (apart from divorce suits) into the lives and habits of the richer classes.

On talking over our plan with such of our friends who, living in the suburbs of London, had the necessary garden, it was not long before we received kindly invitations to take thirty, forty, fifty of our neighbours to spend the afternoon in the country. The day and hour fixed, it was left with us to decide which guests should be invited, and to pass on the invitation. Sometimes our hosts particularly wish to entertain children as well as grown up people; and if so, we include the children in the invitation; but on the whole, experience has taught that these parties are more thoroughly enjoyed from which the children are omitted. This will not be misunderstood when it is remembered that these mothers and fathers have their children, perhaps seven, all small together, constantly with them for 365 days in the year, both day and night; that the children become noisy and excited in the country, and that each child's noise, though it may be music in the ear of its mother, can hardly be anything but what it is, disagreeable sounds, in the ears of its mother's neighbour. Another objection to the presence of the children is the extreme difficulty of entertaining them and the grown people together. To the social gatherings of other classes it is not the rule to invite children with their parents, and the taste or feeling which forbids such a rule is common to the poor.

It is not difficult, knowing many people who would be glad
of a day's outing, to pass on such invitations; but it is pleasanter, if it can be so arranged, that the guests should beforehand be acquainted with each other. For that reason it is better to invite together the members of a mothers' meeting and their husbands, the habitués of a club, the inhabitants of one block of buildings, the denizens of a particular court, the singing-class, the members of any society who worship, work, or learn together—in short, those who unite for any purpose.

There are other advantages in this plan besides the obvious one of the guests being already acquainted. Those who have hitherto seen each other's character from the work point of view only now get another standpoint, and the day's pleasure, together with the hearty laugh and the many-voiced songs, does more than many a pastoral address can do to teach forgiveness and break down barriers raised by quarrels—quarrels which more often owe their origin to close neighbourhoods than to bad tempers. 'Now she ain't such a bad 'un as one would think, considering the way she behaved to my Billy—is she now?' is a true remark illustrating what I would say.

The guests chosen, the invitations go out in the usual form: 'Mrs. So-and-So,' mentioning our hostess's name, 'hopes to have the pleasure of seeing Mr. and Mrs. So-and-So on Monday, 14th, to spend the afternoon in the country,' and then follow the time of the train and the name of the station where the rendezvous is to be held. Added to these the friends connected in any way with the expected guests, the district visitor, the superintendent of the mothers' meeting, the lady rent-collector are also invited; as well as those who have gifts of entertaining or those to whom we wish to introduce our neighbours. A train is generally chosen between one and two o'clock, so as to enable the man to get a half-day's work and the woman to see to necessary household duties and give the children their dinner before she starts.

On reaching the country station the party rambles through the lanes, picking grasses and flowers, taking, if possible, a détour before arriving at the host's house. 'Why, the trees
smell,' exclaimed one town-bred woman in almost awe-struck astonishment, standing under a lilac tree. 'Don't it make one feel gentle-like!' was another remark made more to himself than to anyone else, which came from a rough one-legged board-man, as he stood overlooking a quiet, far-stretching scene near Wimbledon.

Unless one has lived in close streets and amid noise and grinding hurry, it is difficult to understand the pleasures of these walks. The sweetness of the air, the quiet which can be felt, the very fact of strolling in the road without looking out to avoid being run over, are a relief, and the absence of the ever-present anxiety of the care of the children is a great addition to the irresponsible enjoyment of the day.

The destination reached, it is a great help if the host and hostess will come out to meet and welcome the party, as is customary towards guests of other classes. By this simple courtesy the tone is at once given, and the people feel themselves not brought out to a 'treat' but invited and welcomed as guests. I have seen men, among whom we were told when we first went to Whitechapel it was not 'safe' to go alone, entirely changed by the bearing of their hosts to them, and the determination with which they set out to have a 'lark,' at whatever inconvenience to others, gradually melt away under the influence of being treated as gentlemen. 'Why, she said she was glad to see me,' said a low, coarse fellow, taking as a personal compliment to himself the conventional form of expression.

The duty of introducing and welcoming over, we are glad if we find tables on a shady lawn or under a tent ready spread and waiting for us. In the excitement of getting off, the midday meal taken hurriedly has probably been a slight one, and the walk and unwonted fresh air have given good appetites. Sometimes our hostess has made arrangements that all the party should take their food together, and this is the better plan if it can be managed. 'Why, the gentry is sitting down with us. Now I do call that comfortable like,' was overheard on one occasion when this arrangement had
been followed. If the one class waits on the other it but
emphasises the painful class distinctions so sadly prominent
in the ordinary affairs of life, and the feeling aroused in the
minds of the people as they see the richer members of the
party taken by the hostess to the house to have 'something to
eat' is not always amiable, the 'something' being interpreted
as better, anyhow other than that provided for them, or why
should it not have been taken together?

The repast given by our many kindly hosts during these
eight summers of parties has been various. Some add eggs
and bacon to the tea and cakes; others give a large joint,
which is even more enjoyed, a cut off a good 14lb. sirloin of
beef being a rare luxury in the ordinary dietary of the working
classes, while others again offer tea, differing only in quality
from the ordinary afternoon meal which is commonly taken
between lunch and dinner. Some of our hosts give every
variety of cake, such as Scotch housewives delight in making,
though I remember one lady who, while most kind and anxious
to give pleasure, told me, as if it were an additional advantage,
that she had 'had all the cakes made very plain, and that
they were all baked the day before yesterday.'

The meal over, the real pleasure of the day begins, and
this must entirely depend on the capabilities of the hostess for
entertaining and on the possibilities of the garden. If it is
large, there is nothing townpeople like better than to saunter
about, to wander in the shrubberies, to see the hothouses, con-
servatories, ferneries, especially if someone will be the guide
and point out what is interesting, this spot where the best
view is to be obtained, that curious flower, and tell the story
hanging on this queerly-shaped tree. 'Aye, aye, ma'am, it's
all very beautiful, but to my mind you're the most beautiful flower
of the lot,' was the spontaneous compliment elicited from a
weather-beaten costermonger to the stately old lady who had
taken pains to show him her garden, and though the remark
was greeted with shouts of laughter from the surrounding
group, the 'Well, he ain't far wrong, I'm sure,' showed that
the words had only spoken out the thoughts of many.
Sometimes the men go off to play cricket or bowls, to see the puppies or horses, or some other beasts particularly interesting to the masculine mind; or perhaps the interminable game of rounders occupies all the time. Sometimes swings, see-saws, or a row on the pond are great amusements. 'Oh dear, I think I've only just learnt to enjoy myself,' gasped one buxom woman of fifty, breathless with swinging her neighbour, whose face told that her life's holidays could without difficulty be counted; while to a few, the fact of sitting still and looking out and feeling the quiet is pleasure enough. 'I seem to see further than ever I saw before,' murmured a pale young mother, sitting on the Upper Terrace at Hampstead, and as she said it she looked as if the sight of the country just then, when her eyes were reopened by her new motherhood, might, in another sense, make her see farther than she had ever seen before.

If the garden is small and its resources soon ended, games must be resorted to, and such games as 'tersa,' where running and motion are enjoyed; the 'ring and the string,' when eyes and ears must be on the alert; or 'blow the candle blindfold'; all cause hearty fun, especially when the unconscious blindfold, having walked crookedly, energetically blows, as he thinks, at the candle, which is still burning steadily a yard or two from him. On some of these occasions the hostess has her carriage out, and by taking four or five of the guests at a time all have been able to have a short drive, and see from a higher elevation something more of the country.

'Well, I don't know that I was ever in a carriage before,' said one woman, who could hardly be said to have been in one then, as she dismounted from the box. 'Except at funerals,' corrected her neighbour. Might not some of the extraordinary liking which is so common among the poor for attending funerals be partly for the sake of the rare event of a drive? Occasionally it is possible to get up a dance, with the help of a fiddle or piano, and many a pale, worn face has lost, for the time at least, its stamp of weariness as it grew interested in the ups and downs of 'Sir Roger de Coverley.' 'Bless me, if
I ever thought to do any dancing, except the dancing of bobbies,' was an unexpected comment from my partner on one occasion; and many times have I since been referred to to confirm the fact that 'You did see me dancing, didn't you, ma'am?'

Besides these active pleasures, there is the enjoyment of music, the love and appreciation of which is so deep and warm in these uncultured minds—music, which more than anything else helps to smooth away class as well as other inequalities. I have seen rough low-class men and women leave their active games or the swing for which they have been waiting, and cluster round the singer or musician begging for another and yet 'another bit.' What they like best is a song with a chorus, or historical songs where they can hear the words, and next to these solemn music on a harmonium or organ; but any music charms them, and the hostess who is either musical herself or who invites her musical friends to help her finds the task of entertaining much easier. An oft-repeated mistake is that the poor like comic songs about themselves, and 'Betsy Waring' has been suggested and sung at our parties more often than I like to remember. A moment's sympathetic thought will show, however, that the poor want other and wider interest, and it can hardly be the kindliest method of amusing them to sing them a song the joke of which lies in imitations and 'take-offs' of their mispronunciation. It is, too, generally thought that the uneducated cannot appreciate what is commonly understood as 'good music,' but this too is a mistake. Long years ago I remember Mrs. Nassau Senior coming to a night-school of rough girls, held in a rough court. That evening some street row was more attractive than A B C, and our scholars were clustered around the heroine of the fight. I can still see the picture made by Mrs. Senior as she stood and sang in the doorway of the schoolroom, which opened directly on to the court, and among such surroundings it was a deep-sighted sympathy which led her to choose 'Angels ever bright and fair.' For long afterwards she was remembered 'as the lady who came and sang about the angels, and looked like one herself.'
It is well if the hostess can bring her instrument to the window, so that the people can hear as they sit on the lawn outside and enjoy the air; perhaps she may find it possible to ask two or three of her guests who can sing, with strong, sweet, though untrained voices, to join her in a duet or glee, and helping, they enjoy the pleasure with the helper’s joy. Occasionally one of the party may have brought an accordion with which to aid the impromptu concert, or someone will recall the piece of poetry committed to memory long years ago, and then we have a recitation, which pleases none the less because it is ‘Jim Straw’s one bit,’ and has been heard a few times before. If it be wet or windy the hostess may ask her guests into the drawing-room. ‘You did not see the drawing-room, did you, mum?’ asked one of the guests after a party which I had been obliged to leave early; ‘it was lovely, and we all sat there quite friendly-like and listened to the music. I did like the look of that room.’ Very pregnant of influence are these introductions into a house scrupulously clean and tastily furnished—a house kept as the dwelling of every human being should be kept. Do we not know ourselves, if we go to visit a friend with a higher standard of art, morals, or culture, how subtle is the influence; how from such visits (albeit unconsciously, or at least hardly with deliberate resolve) is dated the turning towards the new light, the intention to be more perfect?

One lady, with the real feeling of hostess-ship, took her Whitechapel guests, as she would any others, into a bedroom to take their outdoor things off. Touching, if amusing, was the remark of a girl of fifteen or thereabouts, who, turning to her mother, said, ‘Look, mother, here’s a bed with a room all to itself!’ ‘Has anyone really slept in this white bed?’ was asked by another of the same party. While to others of a rather higher class, who have been servants before marriage, the re-introduction to such a house is a great pleasure though to them not such a revelation as it is to those who have passed all their lives in factories or workshops. It is a welcome reminder of their past, and often suggests little improvements
in the arrangement of their homes. It is a means also of
diffusing a love of beauty, a sense of harmony, and an artistic
taste not to be despised among those who feel that the
‘beauty of holiness’ constitutes its attraction to the right
living which leads to righteousness.

In various ways, too many to describe, but which every
hostess can devise, the hours between half-past four and eight
can be pleasantly filled, until the drawing in of the long sum-
mer evening brings the party to a close. The announcement
of supper is generally greeted with, ‘What, go home already?’
or, ‘The time don’t go so fast working days,’ but garden
parties must necessarily end with daylight, and for folk up at
six in the morning, ten or eleven o’clock is a late enough bed
hour. Supper is generally a small meal—cake, buns, or pastry,
with lemonade, fruit, or cold coffee—simply a light refreshment
taken standing; but some of the friends who entertain us like
better to give the light meal on the arrival of the guests,
and the more substantial one later. The first plan, though,
is perhaps better, as the people leave their homes early, and
many of them miss their dinner altogether amid the necessary
preparation for the long absence.

‘Good-night, sir, and God bless you for this day!’ was
the farewell of one of his guests to his silver-haired host, words
which struck him deeply. ‘Dear me, dear me! why did I
never think of it before?’ he exclaimed; and really this means
of doing good seems so simple and self-evident that it is to be
wondered at that those working among the poor should often
not know where to take their people for a day’s outing.
London suburbs abound with families hardly one of whom
does not give a garden party in the course of the summer, and
yet how few of these parties are to guests ‘who cannot bid
again!’ The expense of such a party is certainly not the
reason of its rarity. An entertainment such as I have told
about, even when meat is given, does not cost more than a
shilling or eighteenpence a head. The trouble cannot be the
deterrent motive, for that is nothing to be compared to the
trouble of a dinner-party, nor even of any ordinary ‘at home.’
'AT HOME' TO THE POOR

The servants would not like it' is sometimes urged as a reason, but it is certainly not the experience of those who, having overcome the objections of their servants, have tried it, and found that they entered thoroughly into the spirit of a party at which they had the pleasant duty of entertaining joined to their usual one of serving, and on more than one occasion the hearty welcome given by the servants has added much to the success of our day.

Perhaps, amid the many difficulties to which modern civilisation has brought us, one of the saddest is the mutual ignorance of the lives and minds of members of the same household—an ignorance often leading to division. It may not, I think, be the least important good of these parties that they afford a subject regarding which master and servant can be, anyhow for one day, of one mind and purpose.

Neither does it require the possession of a mansion or park before such an invitation can be sent; in fact some of the pleasantest parties have been given in the smallest gardens, where kindliness and genial welcome have made up for want of space. One lady, indeed, who was staying for the summer in lodgings in the country gave happy afternoons and pleasant memories to more than eighty people. She asked them in groups of twelve or fourteen, took them long country rambles, or obtained permission to saunter in a neighbour's garden, and when the evenings drew in (it was in August) brought them back to her rooms, where a good tea-supper and a few songs brought the entertainment to a close.

The guests need not always be grown people. It is, perhaps, even more important to give the growing girl or the boy just entering into manhood a taste for simple pleasures. Very delightful is the interest and enjoyment of these young things in the country life and wonders. The evening sewing class, consisting of big girls at work every day in factories; the Bible class of young men; the discussion club; the children-servants (so numerous and so joyless in our great cities)—such little groups can be found around every place of worship, or are known to every one living among or busying
himself for the good of the poor. All are open to invitations, and these can be entertained even more easily than their elders. 'Don't you remember this or that?' my young friends often ask about some trivial incident long since vanished from my memory, and when, demurring, I ask 'When?' the unerring answer, varying in form but monotonous in substance, is, 'Why that day when you took us into the country. You can't forget. It was grand.'

Strangely ignorant are some of these town-bred folk of things which seem to us always to have been known and never to have been taught. They call every flower a rose, and express wonder at the commonest object. 'Law! here's a straw a-growing!' I once heard in a corn-field, and emerging into a fir-wood soon after, we all joined in a laugh at the remark, 'Why, here's hundreds of Christmas trees all together.' Anything, provided it is joined to active movement without which young things never seem quite happy, serves to amuse and to pass the time. A competition to see which girls shall gather the best nosegays, the proposal to the boys to search for some animal, queer plant, or odd stone, have helped to carry the guests over many miles and through long afternoons. Perhaps one of the nicest things which any young lady can do, even if she is not able or allowed to attempt the larger undertaking of a party, is to take some ten or twelve school boys and girls for a walk on their Saturday afternoon holiday. She need keep them, perhaps, only three or four hours, when milk or lemonade and buns, got at any milk-shop, will serve as a substitute for the usual tea.

But, besides these country parties which town-dwellers are quite unable to give, there is still left to us Londoners the possibility (not to say duty) of inviting the poor to our own houses. Our poor neighbours have not been asked to many such parties, but the few to which they have been bidden have been very pleasant. At one our hostess, but lately returned from the East, had arranged tableaux-vivants introducing Oriental costumes in her drawing-room, and the guests were delighted at seeing the people of the one foreign nation of
'AT HOME' TO THE POOR

which they knew anything—the Bible having been the literature which made them conversant with that—as large as life, and all 'real men and solid women.' Another time a little charade was got up, and proud was the mother whose baby was pressed into early service as a play-actor. Other friends have entertained us after a visit to the Kensington Museum or Zoological Gardens, while some evenings have been passed in much the same way as by other people who meet for social pleasure; with talk, music, strange foreign things, portfolios, and puzzles, though games may, perhaps, have occupied a somewhat longer time than is usual among guests with more conversational interests. To all of us have these parties given much pleasure—pleasure which is, in truth, healthful and refreshing amid the sorrow and pain so liberally mingled in the life's cup of the poor. 'This evening I've forgot all the winter's troubles,' followed the 'Good-night' from the lips of a pain-broken woman; and considering the 'winter's troubles' included the death of a child and the semi-starvation resulting from the almost constant out-of-work condition of the husband, the party seemed a strangely inadequate means of producing even temporarily so large a result.

The efforts made to attend are one of the signs of how much these and the country parties are enjoyed. One woman came, with her pulsing, pink ten-days-old baby, and both men and women constantly get up from a sick-bed to return to it again as soon as the pleasure is over. 'We can't afford to lose it, yer see; they don't come too often,' is the sort of answer one usually receives in reply to remonstrance.

But this paper will accomplish its object if 'they do come oftener,' and if not only the poor of our big London, to whom we owe special duties, but if the poor of all great cities are more thought of in the light of guests.

The duty once recognised, the method becomes plain. Every one, even those whose work does not take them among the poor, can manage to be introduced to some who are leading pleasure-barren lives, and to employers of labour in factories
or trades it is especially easy. The introduction made, the rest follows naturally, and though pleasure is in itself so great a good that I would hold the thing worth doing if this alone were obtained, yet I think a prophet's eye is not needed to see the other possible good resulting from such gatherings. The wider interests, the seeds of culture, the introduction to simple recreations, the suggestion of ideal beauty, the possession of happy memories, the class relationships, are the advantages one can rapidly count off as accruing to the entertained, and as important are the gains of the entertainers. The rich, coming face to face with the poor, have seen patience which puts their restlessness to shame; endurance about which poems have yet to be written; hope which is deep and springing from the roots of their being; charity which never faileth, including, as it often does, the adoption of the orphan child or the sharing of the room with a lone woman, compared to which the biggest subscription is as nothing; kindliness which, though unthinking, spareth not itself. Each class has its virtues, but, as yet, they are unknown to each other. It is for the rich to take the first step towards knowing and being known; it is for them to say if the class hatreds, which, like other 'warfare, comes from misunderstanding,' shall exist in our midst. It is for them to make the way of friendship through the wall of gold now dividing the rich from the poor. It is for them to give fellowship which, crushing envy, takes the sting out of poverty. And all this can be done by spending some thought, a little money, and some afternoons in being 'At Home' to the poor.

Great ends these to follow the small trouble and expense of a garden party. It will not, though, be the first time in history that good has been done by means which seemed contemptible, and it will not seem strange to those who have learnt that it is a Life and not a law, friendships and not organisations, which have taught the world its greatest lessons.

Henrietta O. Barnett.
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Once more, as happens in crises of history, rich and poor have met. 'Scientific charity,' or the system which aims at creating respectability by methods of relief, has come to the judgment, and has been found wanting. Societies which helped the poor by gifts have made paupers, churches which would have saved them by preaching have made hypocrites, and the outcome of scientific charity is the working man too thrifty to pet his children and too respectable to be happy.

Those who have tried hardest at planning relief and at bringing to a focus the forces of charity, those who have sacrificed themselves to stop the demoralising out-relief and restore to the people the spirit of self-reliance, will be the first to confess dissatisfaction if they are told that the earthly paradise of the majority of the people must be to belong to a club, to pay for a doctor through a provident dispensary, and to keep themselves unspoiled from charity or pauperism. There is not enough in such hope to call out efforts of sacrifice, and a steady look into such an earthly paradise discloses that the life of the thrifty is a sad life, limited both by the pressure of continuous toil and by the fear lest this pressure should cease and starvation ensue.

The poor need more than food: they need also the knowledge, the character, the happiness which are the gift of God to this age. The age has received His best gifts, but hitherto they have fallen mostly to the rich.

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Nineteenth Century of February 1884.
It is a moment of Peace. To-day there are no battles, but the returns of the dead and wounded from accidents by machinery and from diseases resulting from injurious trades show that there are countless homes in which there must still be daily uncertainty as to the father's return, and many children and wives who become orphans and widows for their country's good.

It is an age of Knowledge. But if returns were made either of the increased health due to the skill of doctors and sanitarians, or of the increased pleasures due to the greater knowledge of the thoughts and acts of other men in other times and countries, it would be shown that neither length of days nor pleasure falls to the lot of the poor. Few are the poor families where the mother will not say, 'I have buried many of mine.' Few are the homes where the talk has any subject beyond the day's doings and the morrow's fears.

It is an age of Travel, but the mass of the poor know little beyond the radius of their own homes. It is no unusual thing to find people within ten miles of a famous sight which they have never seen, and it is the usual thing to find complete ignorance of other modes of life, a thorough contempt for the foreigner and all his ways. The improved means of communication which is the boast of the age, and which has done so much to widen thought, tends to the enjoyment of the rich more than of the poor.

It is an age of the Higher Life. Higher conceptions of virtue, a higher ideal of what is possible for man, are the best things given to our day, but they are received only by those who have time and power to study. 'They who want the necessaries of life want also a virtuous and an equal mind,' says the Chinese sage; and so the poor, being without those things necessary to the growth of mind and feeling, jeopardise Salvation—the possession, that is, of a life at one with the Good and the True, at one with God.

Those who care for the poor see that the best things are missed, and they are not content with the hope offered by 'scientific charity.' They see that the best things might be
shared by all, and they cannot stand aside and do nothing. 'The cruellest man living;' it has been said, 'could not sit at his feast unless he sat blindfold;' and those who see must do something. They may be weary of revolutionary schemes, which turn the world upside down to produce after anarchy another unequal division; they may be weary, too, of philanthropic schemes which touch but the edge of the question. They may hear of dynamite, and they may watch the failure of an Education Act, as the prophets watched the failure of teachers without knowledge. They may criticise all that philanthropists and Governments do, but still they themselves would do something. No theory of progress, no proof that many individuals among the poor have become rich, will make them satisfied with the doctrine of laissez faire; they simply face the fact that in the richest country of the world the great mass of their countrymen live without the knowledge, the character, and the fulness of life which together make the best gift to this age, and that some thousands either beg for their daily bread or live in anxious misery about a wretched existence. What can they do which revolutions, which missions, and which money have not done?

It is in answer to such a question that I make the suggestion of this paper. I make it especially as a development of the idea which underlies a College Mission.

These Missions are generally inaugurated by a visit to a college from some well-known clergyman working in the East End of London or in some such working-class quarter. He speaks to the undergraduates of the condition of the poor, and he rouses their sympathy. A committee is appointed, subscriptions are promised, and after some negotiations a young clergyman, a former member of the college, is appointed as a Mission curate of a district. He at once sets in motion the usual parochial machinery of district visiting, mothers' meetings, clubs, &c. He invites the assistance of those of his old mates who will help; at regular intervals he makes a report of his progress, and if all goes well, he is at last able to tell how the district has become a parish.
The Mission, good as its influence may be, is not, it seems to me, an adequate expression of the idea which moved the promoters. The hope in the College when the first sympathy was roused was that all should join in good work, but the Mission is necessarily a Churchman's effort. The desire was that as University men they should themselves bear the burdens of the poor—but the Mission requires of them little more than an annual guinea subscription.

The grand idea which moved the College, the idea which, like a new creative spirit, is brooding over the face of Society, and is making men conscious of their brotherhood, finds no adequate expression in the district church machinery with which, in East London, I am familiar. There is little in that machinery which helps the people to conceive of religion apart from sectarianism, or of a Church which is 'the nation bent on righteousness.' There is little, too, in the ordinary parochial mechanism which will carry to the homes of the poor a share of the best gifts now enjoyed in the University.

Imagine a man's visit to the Mission District of his college. He has thought of the needs of the poor, and of the way in which those needs are being met. He has formed in his mind a picture of a district where loving supervision has made impossible the wretchedness of 'horrible London'; he expects to find well-ordered houses, people interested in the thoughts of the day, gathering round their pastor to learn of men and of God. He finds instead an Ireland in England, people paying 3s. or 4s. a week for rooms smaller than Irish cabins, without the pure air of the Irish hill-side, and with the vice which makes squalor hopeless. He finds a population dwarfed in stature, smugly content with their own existence, ignorant of their high vocation to be partners of the highest, where even the children are not joyful. He measures the force which the Mission curate is bringing to bear against all this evil. He finds a church which is kept up at a cost of 150l. a year. He finds the clergyman absorbed in holding together his congregation by means of meetings and treats, and almost broken down by the strain put upon him to keep
his parochial organisation going. The clergyman is alone, his church work absorbs his power and attracts little outside help. What can he do to improve the dwellings and widen the lives of 4,000 persons? What can he do to spread knowledge and culture? What can he do to teach the religion which is more than church-going? What wonder if, when he is asked what help he needs, he answers, 'Money for my church,' 'Teachers for my Sunday school,' 'Managers for my clothing club'? What wonder, too, if the visitor, seeing such things and hearing such demands, goes away somewhat discontented, somewhat inclined to give up faith in the Mission, and, what is worse, ready to believe that there is no way by which the best can be given to the poor?

It is to members of the Universities anxious to unite in a common purpose of improving the lives of the people that I make the suggestion that University Settlements will better express their idea. College Missions have done some of the work on which they have been sent, but in their very nature their field is limited. It is in no opposition to these Missions, but rather with a view to more fully cover their idea, that I propose the new scheme. The details of the plan may be shortly stated.

The place of settlement must of course first be fixed. It will be in some such poor quarter as that of East London, where a house can be taken in which there shall be both habitable chambers and large reception-rooms. A man must be chosen to be the chief of the Settlement; he must receive a salary which, like that of the Mission curate, will be guaranteed by the College, and he must make his home in the house. He must have taken a good degree, be qualified to teach, and be endowed with the enthusiasm of humanity. Such men are not hard to find; under a wiser Church government they would be clergymen, and serve the people as the nation's ministers; but, under a Church government which in an age of reform has remained unreformed, they are kept outside, and often fret in other service. One of these, qualified by training to teach, qualified by character to
organise and command, qualified by disposition to make friends with all sorts of men, would gladly accept a position in which he could both earn a livelihood and fulfil his calling. He would be the centre of the University Settlement. Men fresh from college or old University men would come to occupy the chambers as residents. Lecturers in connection with the University Extension Society would be his fellow-lecturers in the reception-rooms, and as the head of such a Settlement he would extend a welcome to all classes in his new neighbourhood.

The old Universities exercise a strange charm; the Oxford or Cambridge man is still held to possess some peculiar knowledge, and the fact that three of the most democratic boroughs are represented by University professors has its explanation. 'He speaks beautiful German, but of course those University gentlemen ought to,' was a man's reflection to me after a talk with a Cambridge professor. Those, too, who may be supposed to know what draws in an advertising poster, are always glad to print after the name of a speaker his degree and college.

Thus it would be that the head of the Settlement would find himself as closely related to his new surroundings as to his old. The same reputation, which would draw to him fellow-scholars or old pupils, would put him in a position to discover the work and thought going on around him. He would become familiar with the teachers in the elementary and middle-class schools, he would measure the work done by clergy and missionaries, he would be in touch with the details of local politics; and, what is most important of all, he would come into sympathy with the hope, the unnamed hope, which is moving in the masses.

The Settlement would be common ground for all classes. In the lecture-room the knowledge gathered at the highest sources would, night after night, be freely given. In the conversation rooms the students would exchange ideas and form friendships. At the weekly receptions of 'all sorts and conditions of men' the residents would mingle freely with the crowd.
The internal arrangements would be simple enough. The Head would undertake the domestic details and fix the price which residents would pay for board and lodging. He would admit new members and judge if the intentions of those who offered were honest. Some would come for their vacations; others occupied during the daytime would come to make the place their home. University men, barristers, Government clerks, curates, medical students, or business men each would have opportunity both for solitary and for associated life, and the expense would be various to suit their various means. The one uniting bond would be the common purpose, 'not without action to die fruitless,' but to do something to improve the condition of the people. It would be the duty of the Head to keep alive among his fellows the freshness of their purpose, 'to recall the stragglers, refresh the out-worn, praise and reinspire the brave.' He would have, therefore, to judge of the powers of each to fill the places to which he could introduce them. To some he would recommend official positions, to some teaching, to some the organisation of relief, to some the visiting of the sick, and thus new life would be infused into existing Churches, Chapels, and Institutions. Others he would introduce as members of Co-operative Societies, Friendly Societies, or Political and Social Clubs. He would so arrange that all should occupy positions in which they would become friends of his neighbours, and discover, perhaps, as none have yet discovered, how to meet their needs.

In such an institution it is easy to see that development might be immeasurable. A born leader of men surrounded by a group of intelligent and earnest friends, pledged not 'to go round in an eddy of purposeless dust,' and placed face to face with the misery and apathy they know to be wrong, would of necessity discover means beyond our present vision. They would bind themselves by sympathy and service to the lives of the people; they would bring the light and strength of intelligence to bear on their government, and they would give a voice both to their needs and wrongs. It is easy to imagine what such settlers in a great town might do, but it will be
more to the point to consider how they may express the idea which underlies the College Mission—the interest, that is, of centres of education in the centres of industry, and the willingness of University men to acknowledge their brotherhood with the people.

If it be that the Missionary’s account of his Mission district fails at last to rouse the interest of his hearers, and if his work seems to be absorbed in the effort to keep going his parochial machinery amid a host of like machines, the same cannot be the fate of the Settlement.

Some of the settlers will settle themselves for longer periods, and those who are occupied during the daytime will find it as possible to live among the poor as among the rich; but there must also be room for those who can spend only a few weeks or months in the Settlement, so that men may come, as some already have come, to East London to spend part of a vacation in serving the people. This interchange of life between the University and the Settlement will keep up between the two a living relation. Each term will bring, not a set speech about the work of the Mission, but the many chats on the wonders of human life. The condition of the English people will come to be a fact more familiar than that of the Grecian or Roman, and the history of the College Settlement will be better known than that of the boat or the eleven. On the other side, thoughts and feelings which are now often spent in vain talks at debating societies will go up to town to refresh those who are spent by labour, or to find an outlet in action.

There is no fear that the College Settlement will fail to rouse interest. Its life will be the life of the College. As long as both draw their strength from the common source, from the same body of members, the sympathy of the College will be with the people. Nor is there any fear lest the work of the settlers become stereotyped, as is often the case with the work of Missions and Societies. Each year, each term would alter the constitution of the Settlement as other settlers brought in other characters and the results of other knowledge, or as their ideas became modified by common work.
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with the various religious and secular organisations of the neighbourhood. The danger, indeed, would not be from uniformity of method or narrowness of aim; rather would it be the endeavour of the Head to limit the diversity which many minds would introduce, and restrain a liberality willing to see good in every form of earnestness. The variety of work which would embrace the most varied effort, and enlist its members in every movement for the common good, would keep about the Settlement the beauty of a perpetual promise.

If we go further, and ask how this plan reaches deeper than others which have gone before, the question is not so easily answered, because it is impossible to prophesy that a University Settlement will make the poor rich or give them the necessaries of true life. Inasmuch, though, as poverty—poverty in its true sense, including poverty of the knowledge of God and man—is largely due to the division of classes, a University Settlement does provide a remedy which goes deeper than that provided by popular philanthropy.

The poor man of modern days has to live in a quarter of the town where he cannot even try to live with those superior to himself. Around him are thousands educated as he has been educated, with taste and with knowledge on a level no higher than his own. The demand for low things has created a supply of low satisfactions, the amusements are therefore unrecreative, the lectures un instructive, and the religion uninspiring. It is not possible for the inhabitant of the poor quarter to come into casual intercourse with the higher manners of life and thought except at a cost for travelling which would constitute a large percentage of his income.

I am afraid that it is long before we can expect the rich and poor again to live as neighbours; for good or evil they have been divided, and other means must, for the present, be found for making common the property of knowledge. One such means is the University Settlement.

Men who have knowledge may become friends of the poor and share that knowledge and its fruits as, day by day, they meet in their common rooms for talk or for instruction, for music or for play.
They will be able to join in that which is done by other societies, while they share all their best with the poor, and in the highest sense make their property common. They may be some of the best charity agents, for they will have an experience out of the reach of others, which they will have accumulated through their different agencies. As members of various secular and religious organisations, they may be able to compare notes after the day's work, and offer evidence as to how the poor live which, in days to come, may be invaluable. They may be some of the best educators, for, bringing ever-fresh stores of thought, they will see the weak spots in a routine which daily tires a child because it does so little to teach him, and they will have an opinion on national education better worth considering than the grumbles of those who are weary with most things, or the congratulations of officials who judge by examinations. They may be the best Church reformers, for they will make more and more manifest how it is not institutions, but righteousness, which exalts a nation; how, one after another, all reforms fail because men tell lies and love themselves; and how, therefore, the first of all reforms is the reform of the Church, whose mission for the nation is that it create righteousness.

There is, then, for the settler of a University Settlement an ideal worthy of his sacrifice. He looks not to a church buttressed by party spirit, nor to a community founded on self-helped respectability. He looks rather to a community where the best is most common, where there is no more hunger and misery, because there is no more ignorance and sin—a community in which the poor have all that gives value to wealth, in which beauty, knowledge, and righteousness are nationalised.

Samuel A. Barnett.

[This paper was read at a meeting at St. John's College, Oxford, in November 1883, and resulted in the foundation of Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel, and other University Settlements in poor districts of large towns.]
PICTURES FOR THE PEOPLE

‘It is folly, if nothing worse, to attempt it. What do the people want with fine art? They will neither understand nor appreciate it. Show them an oleograph of “Little Red Riding Hood,” or a coloured illustration of “Daniel in the Lions’ Den,” and they will like it just as much as Mr. Millais’s “Chill October” or Mr. Watts’s “Love and Death.”’

Such opinions met us at every turn when we first began to think of having an art exhibition in Whitechapel. But we knew that it is not only indifference which keeps the people living in the far East away from the West End art treasures. The expense of transit; the ignorance of ways of getting about; the shortness of daylight beyond working hours during the greater part of the year; the impression that the day when they could go is sure to be the day when the museum is ‘closed to the public’—all these little discouragements become difficulties, especially to the large number who have not yet had enough opportunities of knowing the joy which art gives.

‘Well, I should not have believed I could have enjoyed myself so much, and yet been so quiet,’ describes a lesson learnt from an hour spent in Mr. Watts’s Gallery at Little Holland House; and once, after showing a party of mechanics a large photograph of the Dresden Madonna, I was asked, ‘Where now can we see such things often?’ while further talk on the picture elicited from another of the same group,

---

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Cornhill Magazine, March 1883
It is a moment of Peace. To-day there are no battles, but the returns of the dead and wounded from accidents by machinery and from diseases resulting from injurious trades show that there are countless homes in which there must still be daily uncertainty as to the father’s return, and many children and wives who become orphans and widows for their country’s good.

It is an age of Knowledge. But if returns were made either of the increased health due to the skill of doctors and sanitarians, or of the increased pleasures due to the greater knowledge of the thoughts and acts of other men in other times and countries, it would be shown that neither length of days nor pleasure falls to the lot of the poor. Few are the poor families where the mother will not say, ‘I have buried many of mine.’ Few are the homes where the talk has any subject beyond the day’s doings and the morrow’s fears.

It is an age of Travel, but the mass of the poor know little beyond the radius of their own homes. It is no unusual thing to find people within ten miles of a famous sight which they have never seen, and it is the usual thing to find complete ignorance of other modes of life, a thorough contempt for the foreigner and all his ways. The improved means of communication which is the boast of the age, and which has done so much to widen thought, tends to the enjoyment of the rich more than of the poor.

It is an age of the Higher Life. Higher conceptions of virtue, a higher ideal of what is possible for man, are the best things given to our day, but they are received only by those who have time and power to study. ‘They who want the necessaries of life want also a virtuous and an equal mind,’ says the Chinese sage; and so the poor, being without those things necessary to the growth of mind and feeling, jeopardise Salvation—the possession, that is, of a life at one with the Good and the True, at one with God.

Those who care for the poor see that the best things are missed, and they are not content with the hope offered by ‘scientific charity.’ They see that the best things might be
shared by all, and they cannot stand aside and do nothing. 'The cruellest man living,' it has been said, 'could not sit at his feast unless he sat blindfold,' and those who see must do something. They may be weary of revolutionary schemes, which turn the world upside down to produce after anarchy another unequal division; they may be weary, too, of philanthropic schemes which touch but the edge of the question. They may hear of dynamite, and they may watch the failure of an Education Act, as the prophets watched the failure of teachers without knowledge. They may criticise all that philanthropists and Governments do, but still they themselves would do something. No theory of progress, no proof that many individuals among the poor have become rich, will make them satisfied with the doctrine of laissez faire; they simply face the fact that in the richest country of the world the great mass of their countrymen live without the knowledge, the character, and the fulness of life which together make the best gift to this age, and that some thousands either beg for their daily bread or live in anxious misery about a wretched existence. What can they do which revolutions, which missions, and which money have not done?

It is in answer to such a question that I make the suggestion of this paper. I make it especially as a development of the idea which underlies a College Mission.

These Missions are generally inaugurated by a visit to a college from some well-known clergyman working in the East End of London or in some such working-class quarter. He speaks to the undergraduates of the condition of the poor, and he rouses their sympathy. A committee is appointed, subscriptions are promised, and after some negotiations a young clergyman, a former member of the college, is appointed as a Mission curate of a district. He at once sets in motion the usual parochial machinery of district visiting, mothers' meetings, clubs, &c. He invites the assistance of those of his old mates who will help; at regular intervals he makes a report of his progress, and if all goes well, he is at last able to tell how the district has become a parish.
The first Exhibition included—besides pictures—pottery, needlework, and curiosities; but, interesting as these were, the expense of getting them together, providing cases for them, and showing them thoroughly under glass, was so great that in the second exhibition it was determined to exhibit only pictures and such works of art and curiosities as the Kensington Museum would lend us, the latter already in cases, and with their own special caretaker to boot.

The cataloguing and describing committee comes last; and its work, though done in a hurry, bore no slight relation to the success of the undertaking.

It is impossible for the ignorant to even look at a picture with any interest unless they are acquainted with the subject; but when once the story is told to them, their plain, direct method of looking at things enables them to go straight to the point, and perhaps to reach the artist’s meaning more clearly than some of those art critics whose vision is obscured by thoughts of ‘tone, harmony, and construction.’

Mr. Richmond’s fine picture of ‘Ariadne’ elicited many remarks. ‘Why, it is crazy Jane!’ exclaimed one woman, following up the declaration in a few moments by, ‘and it’s finely done, too’; but the story once explained, either by catalogue or talk, the interest increased. ‘Poor soul! she’s seen her day,’ came from a genuine sympathiser. ‘Oh, no! she’ll get another lover; rest sure of that.’ ‘Tain’t quite likely, seeing that it’s a desert island!’ was the practical retort, which rather dumbfounded the hopeful commentator; but she would have the last word: ‘Well, I would, if it were myself, and she’ll find a way, sure enough, somehow.’ ‘The light is all behind her,’ showed a delicate perception of what, perhaps, the artist himself had put in with the truth of unconsciousness.

Mr. Briton Rivière’s representation of the ‘Dying Gladiator’ was the subject of much conversation. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to remind anyone of the picture, which was in the Academy but a year or two ago. The splendid painting of the tigers, both dead and living, with the
vividly depicted physical agony of the martyr, in spite of
which he feels triumphant as, faithful even in death, he makes
the sign of the cross in the sand, have probably made an
impression on, and been remembered by, those who saw it.

‘There, my boy, there’s your ancestor in the lions’ den!’
was the paternal explanation of one of Abraham’s descendants
to his small son; but a reference to the catalogue changed his
opinion on the subject, if not on the goodness of the cause for
which the gladiator suffered. The description in the catalogue
for this picture was: ‘The Romans, for their holiday amuse-
ment, made their prisoners fight with wild beasts. The
young Christian has killed one of the tigers; but is himself
mortally wounded. His last act is to trace in the sand the
form of a cross, the sign of the faith for which he dies. The
shouts of the excited crowd, the roar of the baulked tiger, are
fading in his ears. God has kissed him and he will sleep.’
Somewhat fanciful, perhaps, but reaching, maybe, the spirit
of the picture more truly than a plainer statement of facts
would have done. ‘“God kissed him,” it says; I should
have said the tiger clawed him,’ was the one adverse criticism
overheard on the description. As a rule, the subject of the
picture once understood, the people stood before it in thought-
ful consideration.

Mr. Richmond’s ‘Sleep and Death,’ as well as Mr. Watts’s
‘Time, Death, and Judgment,’ both ideal rather than his-
torical or domestic pictures, were greatly enjoyed, and this
by a class of people whose external lives are drearily barren
of ideals.

An interpretation offered by any one who had studied the
parable pictures was eagerly accepted, and further thoughts sug-
gested. ‘You can’t see Judgment’s face for his arm,’ perhaps
had, perhaps had not, more meaning in it than the speaker
meant; while in reference to the woman’s listless dropping of
her flowers from her lap in ‘Time, Death, and Judgment,’ the
remark, ‘Death does not want the flowers now she’s got ‘em,’
told of thoughtful suffering at the apparent wastefulness of
death. ‘Time is young yet, then,’ made one feel that the
speaker had caught a glimpse of life's possibilities with which probably any number of homilies had failed to impress him.

'Sleep and Death,' depicting the strong, pale warrior borne on the shoulders of Sleep, while being gently lifted into the arms of Death—so simple in colour, pure in idea, rich in suggestion—was good for the poor to see, among whom Death is robbed of none of its terrors by the coarse familiarity with which it is treated. With them funerals are too often a time of great rowdiness, and 'a beautiful corpse' a fit spectacle for all the neighbours—even the youngest child—to be invited to see. Death treated as a tender mother-woman, hidden in the cold grey vastness surrounding her, was a bright idea, producing, perhaps, greater modesty about the great mystery.

'That's the best of the whole lot, to my mind,' came, after a long gaze, from a pale, trouble-stricken man, whose sorrows Sleep had not always helped to bear, and whose loveless life had made Death's enfolding arms seem wondrous kind.

Sometimes there were discussions as to which was Sleep and which Death, ended once summarily by the loudly expressed opinion, 'It don't much matter which. I don't call it proper, anyhow, to see a man pickaback of an angel!'—a hypercritical sense of propriety which was hardly to be expected from the appearance of the critic.

Munkacsy's picture of the 'Lint Pickers,' lent by Mr. J. S. Forbes, aroused much interest. In the catalogue, after a short account of the artist's life and works, it was described thus: 'A soldier, with a bandaged leg, is telling the story of the war to the women and children who are picking lint to dress wounds. The different feelings with which the news is received are shown with wonderful skill in the different faces. Some are waiting to hear the worst; another has already heard it, and can only bury her face in her hands. To others it is but an interesting story; while the little child is only intent on his basket of lint.

Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn.'

The gloom of the picture, the utter dejection of the workers,
relieved nowhere by a gleam of light—even the child (around whom Hope might have hovered) finding a grim plaything in the lint—all combine to tell the tale of what the artist evidently felt—the cruelty of war. Much interest was taken in finding out, amid the darkness, the different figures in their various attitudes of active or crushed woe. It spoke, though, a little sadly, for the want of joyousness in East London entertainments that more than one sightseer, before reading the catalogue or being helped by a verbal explanation, thought 'it was a lot of poor people at tea.'

The frames of all the pictures excited wonder, sometimes admiration not accorded to the pictures themselves; and the oft-reiterated questions, 'What, now, is it all worth? How much would it fetch?' became a little wearisome, not the less so because expressive of one of the signs of the times.

'All beautiful! and most of them [the pictures] done by machinery, I suppose,' showed greater mechanical than artistic appreciation; while the cross-examination to which we were put as to why the Exhibition was held, was sometimes interesting rather than edifying. 'Oh, yes, it'll pay, sure enough, if you only go on long enough,' was one woman's comforting assurance; and the answer, 'I hardly see how, considering it is open free,' carried so little force to her mind that its only effect was to make her repeat her belief in a still more confidently cheery tone. But many and hearty were the thanks that were given at the end of some such chats; and the gentlemen who explained the pictures and talked to the little groups which quickly gathered round 'some one who would tell about it all' were more than once offered reward-money—a flattering tribute to their powers, and illustrative of the living sense of justice in the workman's mind and the conviction that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire.'

The pathetic pictures were, perhaps, the most generally appreciated. Israel's 'Day before the Departure,' lent by Mr. J. S. Forbes, was described thus: 'The widow, utterly sad, has shut her Bible and seems heartbroken and hopeless. The child does not understand everything, but she knows her
mother is sorry; the toy is forgotten, while she nestles close in her desire to comfort. Her love may be the light which will brighten the future,' often reduced the beholders to sympathetic silence; while warm was the praise given to Salentin's 'Foundling,' a pretty picture of an old yeoman giving the forsaken babe into the arms of his kindly daughters. The bright evening sky, the tender springtime, the interest of the farm-boy, and the curiosity of the sheep, all hopefully express that the little one's short, troublous day is over, and that its happier spring-time has dawned.

'Our Father's House,' by Wilfrid Lawson: the little, ragged girl peeping wistfully round the church pillar at the fashionably dressed congregation, who too often monopolise 'Our Father's House,' had always around it some quiet and earnest students. It aroused in them, perhaps, the sleeping sense, now so often forgotten that it is almost ignored, that the church is the people's possession, and, maybe, it awakened the hope, deep down (if sometimes visionary) in every breast, of the coming of the 'good time' when all class and unworthy distinctions will be lost in the Father's presence.

Israel's works, of which in the last Exhibition there were five, were duly appreciated, not perhaps by the mass, but by the more thoughtful of the spectators. 'The Canal Boat, a picture full of sadness; the man and woman looked weary and worked. Nature is in tune with their hard life; still there is progress,' said the catalogue. I overheard one man say, 'Ah! poor chap, he's got into a wrong current, but he'll get out all right. Pull away.' The picture, sketchy as it was, had taught in Israel's style the lesson he loves to give—the pain and dreariness of life interlaced with the bright thread of hope—

Out of sight;
That thread of all-sustaining beauty,
Which runs through all and doth all unite.

Mr. Walter Crane's picture of 'Ormuzd and Ahriman,' which he kindly lent, awoke much interest. The people read, or had read to them, the description which told that the Per-
sians believed in two gods—the god of good, Ormuzd; the god of evil, Ahriman—and how the picture expressed the fight between the two; a fight going on in every nation and every heart, all nature being represented as standing still during the conflict; while the river of time wound gently on past the ruins of the Memnons, the Acropolis, the Grove, the Altar, and the Abbey—the symbols of the world’s great religions. ‘I expect that’s true, but we don’t seem to see much of the fight about here,’ was one cogent remark. Most frequently, though, a picture will draw forth no expression—for with the unlettered all expression is difficult, and we know how, in the presence of death, of a grand sunset, or of anything deeply moving, silence seems most fitting.

Sometimes, though, one overhears talks which reveal much. Mr. Schmalz’s picture of ‘Forever’ had one evening been beautifully explained, the room being crowded by some of the humblest people, who received the explanation with interest but in silence. The picture represented a dying girl to whom her lover has been playing his lute, until, dropping it, he seemed to be telling her with impassioned words that his love is stronger than death, and that in spite of the grave and separation, he will love her forever. I was standing outside the Exhibition in the half-darkness, when two girls, hatless, with one shawl between them thrown round both their shoulders, came out. They might not be living the worst life; but, if not, they were low down enough to be familiar with it, and to see in that the only relation between men and women. The idea of love lasting beyond this life, making eternity real, a spiritual bond between man and woman, had not occurred to them until the picture with the simple story was shown them. ‘Real beautiful, ain’t it all?’ said one. ‘Ay, fine, but that “Forever,” I did take on with that,’ was the answer. Could anything be more touching? What work is there nobler than that of the artist who, by his art, shows the degraded the lesson that Christ himself lived to teach?

The landscapes were, perhaps, the pictures least cared for; and this is not to be wondered at, considering how little the
poorer denizens of our large towns can know of the country or of nature's varied and peculiar garbs, which artists delight to illustrate. 'How far is it to that place?' was eagerly asked before a picture of Venice, by R. M. Chevalier, a picture of which the description told how the Grand Canal was the 'Whitechapel Road' of Venice, and further explained the relationship of gondolas to omnibuses and cabs—a relationship not understood at once by the untravelled world. 'Would it cost much money to go and see that?' was often provoked by such pictures as Elijah Walton's picture of 'Crevasses in the Mer de Glace,' kindly lent by Mr. H. Evill, or Mr. Croft's 'Matterhorn,' lent by Mr. T. L. Devitt, and described: 'A peak in the Alps too steep for snow, and until lately too steep for mountaineers.' Chains have now been placed at the most difficult places, and several English ladies have reached the top. The artist shows the loneliness of greatness:

The solemn peaks but to the stars are known,
But to the stars, and to the cold lunar beams;
Alone the sun rises, and alone
Spring the great streams.—Matthew Arnold.

With the knowledge of the indifference, because of the unhelped and inevitable ignorance of the town poor in respect to landscape art, special pains were taken with the description, with the idea with which they were already familiar, or to relate it to some moral association which would attract notice: for instance, Mr. John Brett's 'Philory, King of the Cliffes,' was brought nearer to the spectators by the suggestion that the coast of England was, like its people, cool and strong, and not to be hurt by a storm'; and Mr. W. Luker's picture of 'Burnham Beeches,' lent by Mr. S. Winkworth, gained in interest because the catalogue said it was 'A forest near Slough, about eighteen miles from London, bought by the City of London, and made the property of the people.'

Mr. W. S. Wyllie's 'Antwerp,' a grey, flat picture, had its idea partly embodied in 'Sea and land seemed to end in the
cathedral spire'; while the familiar proverb, 'It is an ill wind that blows nobody good,' drew attention to Mr. W. C. Nakkens's 'Harvesting in Holland'; and the suggestion that 'the horses are enjoying the wind which is blowing up the rain, the farmer's enemy in harvest,' showed the standpoint from which the picture could be looked at.

Not that the catalogue was intended to contain exhaustive explanations of the pictures, but only indications of the lines along which the people could make their own discoveries. Full, however, as some of the descriptions were, they were not full enough to prevent misconceptions. A little copy of Tintoretto, lent by Mr. E. Bale, depicting the visit and embrace of the Virgin Mary and Elisabeth, simply entered in the catalogue as the 'Meeting of Mary and Elisabeth,' was mistaken for an interview between Mary, Queen of Scots, and Queen Elizabeth, and produced the reflection, 'I suppose that was before they quarrelled, then'—a sign that historical had, in this instance, made more mark than Bible instruction.

Information about Darwin, concerning whose work the catalogue was silent, was finally volunteered by one of a little group who pronounced him to be 'the Monkey Man'; and another knew no more about Gladstone than that 'he was the chap that followed Lord Beaconsfield.'

'Lesbia,' by Mr. J. Bertrand, explained as 'A Roman girl musing over the loss of her pet bird,' was commented on by, 'Sorrow for her bird, is it? I was thinking it was drink that was in her'—a grim indication of the opinion of the working classes of their 'betters'; though another remark on the same picture, 'Well, I hope she will never have a worse trouble,' showed a kindlier spirit and perhaps a sadder experience.

But the catalogue once studied, it was clung to with almost comical persistency. A picture by Jacob Maris, lent by Mr. J. S. Forbes, of a 'Street in Amsterdam,' was next in the catalogue, though not in the room, to one of Mr. F. F. Dicksee's of 'Christ walking on the Water.' The Amsterdam picture was one in Maris's best style—a row of quaint, irregular houses, boats by the wharf, still cold water from the midst of
which a post protruded, catching the light. 'No doubt a fine picture,' commented a spectator, 'but it requires a deal of imagination.' 'Why? I don't see that; it's plain enough: there are the ships, houses, wharf,' explained a friendly neighbour. 'Yes, I see all them; but it's the rest of it that wants the imagination.' Further pause, and then, 'Oh! I see; I've got the wrong number; I thought it was "Christ walking on the Water"—that's what I was looking for.'

The historical or domestic pictures, such as J. B. Burgess's 'Presentation,' the English ladies visiting the house of a Moor who is presenting his children to them; or Edwin Long's 'Question of Propriety,' the priests watching the dancing-girl to decide if the dance was proper or not, perhaps attracted the most immediate attention, just in proportion as they told their own tale; but, aided by catalogue or talk, the pictures embodying the highest spiritual truths became the most popular.

The sentiment pervading J. F. Millet's 'Angelus' which makes prayer—the communion with the 'Besetting God'—at evening time, 'Earth's natural vesper hour,' seem right and fitting was an unspoken sermon beyond their comprehension as art critics, but within their reach as men and women capable of communion with the highest. And, at present, when ordinary religious influences appear to make so sadly little impression, shall we not use such pictures also as stepping-stones towards the truer life?

Some amount of fine art is now lost to the world because the construction of most modern houses puts narrow limits to the size of pictures. 'We are often unable to express our best ideas for want of room,' I was told by a living artist whom this or any age would, I think, call great; and another painter has had what he considers his finest picture left on his hands because it is too big for any drawing-room and most galleries. Is there not a double work here for the rich to do? Might they not, by buying such pictures, encourage the artists to paint their best thoughts, whatever size they require, thus making the world richer by enabling it to possess a little more of the knowledge gained by those who 'hang on to the sun-
skirts of the Most High? Might they not put them as gifts or loans on the walls of churches or hospitals, making bare walls speak great truths, not the less audible because of the murmur of the people's thanks, real, if unheard by the donors?

Pictures will not do everything. They will not save souls, for 'it takes a life to save a life'; but shall such works be kept only for the amusement or passing interest of the rich? Shall not we, who care that the people should have life and fuller life, press them into the service of teaching? Words, mere words, fall flat on the ears of those whose imaginations are withered and dead; but art, in itself beautiful, in ideas rich, they cannot choose but understand, if it be brought within their reach.

Art may do much to keep alive a nation's fading higher life when other influences fail adequately to nourish it; and how shall we neglect it in these hard times of spiritual starvation? In Mrs. Browning's words

'The artist keeps up open roads between the seen and the unseen. Art is the witness of what is behind the show.'

Henrietta O. Barnett.
A PEOPLE'S CHURCH

'The object of the British Constitution is to get twelve honest men into a jury box,' is an old-fashioned saying, which puts shortly enough the far-off end of our laws and institutions. The jury box may not itself survive, but whatever takes its place must in the same way depend on an honest public opinion. The object of the British Constitution is to secure freedom for thought and honesty among men. When its laws are enforced by the service of the citizens, and when the citizens are honest, politicians may cease to think of the need of reform.

Reforms in the Constitution are now urged because they will make possibilities for greater honesty and greater devotion, but if the possibilities are not used the reforms will make little change for the better. A man who has a vote may be put within reach of a higher virtue, but if he gives his vote dishonestly, the reform which enfranchised him will not tend to progress. A tenant who is secured from eviction, and the landlord out of whose hands the power to evict has been taken, may thank the land-law reformers, who have made honesty more easy; but if the tenant uses his power to make slaves of his labourers or his children, and the landlord his freedom from responsibility to do what he likes, the last state will be little better than the first. A population which is educated, through the efforts of the educational reformers, may have new capacities for virtue; but if they who are educated use

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Contemporary Review of November 1884.
ir powers only to take care of themselves, there may at last a difficulty in getting any to serve as jurymen.

The self-devotion which makes men willingly leave business to some public duty, and the honesty which makes them ordinate interest to justice, are essential to the greatness and happiness of the people.

No Constitution can neglect the means which are to develop these qualities. Neglect of duty is, therefore, punished by fines, performance of duty is rewarded by the honours of title; honesty is prevented by a system of checks, which is ever being elaborated by new laws. All such means fail, and it has come a proverb that virtue cannot be made by Act of Parliament.

The Church is a part of the British Constitution, and is the means by which in old days honesty was promoted; and in these modern days the Church fails, its failure, at any te, has given no ground for a corresponding proverb, that virtue cannot be made by a religious agency. The majority will believe that if men were spiritually-minded they would care for things that are honest, and give themselves to duty for the spirit of the saints and puritans. There may be a morality which is independent of religion; but there is still confidence in the power of the Spirit to carry men over the rough road of duty. There is still a willingness to trust in spiritual agencies to promote morality.

Stated widely, the Church exists to spiritualise life. The ritual and the doctrine, which are often regarded as ends, are the means to this further end. A National Church exists to connect the life of individuals and the life of the nation with the life of God, in Whom all fulness is, to fill men with grace and truth, to make them to respond to high emotions and settle them on eternal calm. Its object is to make men friends, to unite all classes in common aims, to give them open minds, willing to learn, and to introduce them to whatever is honest and of good report. The Church aims to develop the sense of duty through the sense of God.

That the Church of England should fail to reach this object
is not surprising. In an age of free trade, as a 'protected' society, it starts at a disadvantage. In an age of self-government, as a system which is not under popular control, it is suspected. In a democratic age, as an aristocratic organisation, it is not understood.

Chivalry worked well in its own day. The times changed, and there was no room in the new age for knights errant. Many were sorry to see it pass away, with its swift remedies for wrong, its attractive dress, and its power for good. They tried to revive its force, and 'Don Quixote' is a satire on the effort. The good man, with all his devotion, was out of place; the knight of the old age was the butt of the new age. Such a satire might be made on a Church which tries by old forms and through an old constitution to spiritualise life. A few followers may be attracted by sentiment, clinging to memories of good old times, and by striking forms of devotion; but the majority will feel that the effort with all its beauty is out of place, and that the realities of the old age have become the pictures of the new age.

The Church of England is not, therefore, effective to spiritualise the life of the nation and to develop honesty of living. Its present position is indeed indefensible. As a 'Reformed' Church, it offers the example of the greatest abuses. As a 'Catholic' Church, it promotes the principle of schism. As a 'National' Church, it is out of touch with the nation.

There is no other department in the State which can match the abuses connected with the sale of livings, with the common talk about 'preference' and 'promotion,' with the irremovability of indolent, incapable, and unworthy incumbents, with the restriction of worship to words which expressed the wants of another age, and with the use of tests to exclude from the ranks of ministers those called by God to teach in fresh forms the newest revelations to mankind. There are no greater supporters of the schism from which they pray to be delivered than the bishops and clergymen who talk of 'the Church' as if it were a sect to promote 'Church of England'.
societies, and strive to cut off from the body of the people a section of its members. There is nothing national which so little concerns the nation as its Church. By the vast majority of those who are the coming rulers, namely, by the working class, the Church and its services are unused. The parson may here and there be popular as a man; he may even be regarded as of some use to take the chair at meetings, to get up charitable societies, and promote the education or the amusement of the people. But he is not looked to for the help he can give to life, and it is not through him that the people hope to get vice put down, virtue promoted, and life spiritualised.

The place of the Church in the Constitution is forgotten; so when there is a complaint that impurity is sapping the strength of the nation, or that cheating is ruining trade, or that selfishness is making men scamp work, it is not the clergy who are called on to do their duty and make a cure, but a new society is formed or a new law is demanded, and the clergy are not even rebuked for neglect. No one seems to expect that a Church, nominally co-extensive with the nation, which is established to spiritualise life, should do its work. The position is indefensible. Those politicians who are moved only by agitation may say, 'The condition of the Church is not one of practical politics,' and pass on. The greater number realising that the ultimate conflict is between those who would govern with God and those who would govern without God, and anxious that the Church should be effective for its purpose, are quietly making up their minds to one of two solutions—Disestablishment or Reform.

The present means for making the people virtuous or honest fail. 'Disestablish,' urge the Liberationists. 'Let the clergy of the Church be stirred by competition and roused by interest, and we shall have better results.'

'Let the connection with the State continue,' say the Reformers; 'let the abuses be eradicated, but leave the teachers of the nation to be moved by duty and not by bigotry or sectarian rivalry.'

These two solutions for making effective the means of de-
veloping honesty offer themselves for examination. It is worthy of remark that the common arguments for Disestablishment, except those urged by the opponents of all religion, hardly touch the principle of Establishment.

Secularists urge that religion being useless and spirituality a fancy, it is no business of the State to do anything to spiritualise the life of its members as a means to increase virtue. Their position is unassailable, and the day on which the nation decides that God has no relation to life, the Church as a spiritualising agency must be disestablished, its buildings turned into lecture halls, and its endowments devoted to the reduction of the national debt or to the teaching of art and science.

The position of the Secularists is occupied by few. The ordinary advocate of Disestablishment is anxious that the life of the nation may be spiritualised, but he sees that the Church is ineffective, he marks its abuses, its rivalry with the sects, and its assumption of superiority. He argues that its ineffectiveness and its assumption are due to its connection with the State, and urges that Disestablishment alone will sweep out the abuses. He condemns abuses but he cannot condemn a principle which affirms the duty of the State to teach the higher life, because he himself has probably approved the principle as a supporter of Education Acts, liquor laws, and other legislation of a like aim.

It is allowed by the majority of the people that the State should teach the life of prudence, and schools are established under local School Boards to teach every child, so that he may earn his living. Further, it is allowed that the State should control the forces which, for good or evil, may rouse the people, and thus licensing boards are established to limit the sale of strong drink.

The same principle is involved in an Established Church. If the State educates the citizens, and admits its responsibility for the formation of their characters, a line can hardly be drawn at a point which would exclude it from giving the people the means which are the best security for happiness and for morality.
The principle of Establishment does not—as its opponents often think—assert that a sect has truth; it asserts that the nation has truth, or is seeking it. The truth abides in the best thought of the whole nation, and the Church is established to express that truth. The clergy have no special rights, they are servants appointed to do the will of the nation. Truth abides not in 'the Church' of the bishops and clergy nor in a book, it abides in the people. Once when it was proposed in the House of Commons to refer a matter of doctrine to the bishops, 'No, by the faith I bear to God,' said Mr. Wentworth, with the approval of the House, 'we will pass nothing before we understand what it is, for that were to make you Popes.' It is the people, therefore, which by its Parliament has settled, and may again settle, the limits of teaching and ritual.

The nation, in old language, is holy. The body of people called English is set apart for a special service, its laws are laws of God, its work is worship, and every one of its members owes a duty to God. The memory of such a fact was kept alive in Israel where every town's meeting was a congregation, every parliament a solemn assembly, every law the Word of God, and every workman was inspired by the Spirit of God. The Jewish nation has been preserved in the Jewish Church. The fact that the English nation is holy must also be kept alive. The nation, that is, must be a Church and its citizens organised for worship. 'The spirit of nationality,' says Burke, 'is at once the bond and the safeguard of nations; it is something above laws and beyond thrones, the impalpable element, the inner life of states.' In his own language Burke asserts the holiness of nations, and it is with a view to protect this impalpable element that it becomes so important for nations to identify their secular and religious aspects, to be at once nations and churches with duties to men and to God.

Disestablishment denies this holiness, and so lets escape the strongest element in nationality. Disestablishment is, moreover, a short-sighted policy, because, however great be the measure of Disendowment, it would make the Church of
England the strongest of the sects. In a short time one of
the parties now held in union within the Establishment would
obtain the supremacy, and that party would inherit all the
power and prestige of the position. This party—being only a
section of the religious body—would pose as the representative
of religion, and its clergy would identify their interests with
the interest of God. Again, there would be some Becket to
oppose the will of Parliament, and to call some law affecting
his order 'irreligious,' and a clericalism would be let loose to
assume, and perhaps make hateful, the name of religion.
'Clericalism is the enemy of men,' is a saying which has much
truth in it. The pity is if clericalism and religion are enabled
to seem to be the same thing.

Disestablishment, finally, would intensify the competition
of sects. To make one proselyte, the supporters of various
forms would compass sea and land. The standard of morality
would be lowered, and the flags of doctrine, invented out of
will-worship, would be waved to bring in rich adherents, and
get the use of their money. Even, as it is, there is no need
to go far to find work, which would fall to pieces if the preacher
spoke the truth to the subscribers about their private life or
their tempers. It is urged that the congregations in American
non-established Churches are large; it is not urged that the
people in America are above bribery in politics or above cheating
in trade. It is not urged that American social life is
spiritualised, and that is the only fact which would be evidence
of the good of the system.

To sum up the case against those who offer Disestablish-
ment of the Church as an answer to the question, 'How is
the nation to be brought into union with the spirit of good-
ness?' it may be urged that—

1. Disestablishment is a destructive and wasteful method
of getting rid of abuses, and would destroy the power of the
State to teach what the State holds to be truth.

2. Disestablishment would establish clericalism, a force
which more than once in history has made religion hateful,
and roused for its repression the God-fearing men of the nation.
3. Disestablishment, trusting to competition, would leave poor neighbourhoods unhelped. A poor congregation could not hope for a church in which worship should be stirred by the beauty of sight and sound. An ignorant population would not exert itself to get either a church or a teacher. The most needy would thus be the most neglected. It is only the State which can give with equal hand to all its members, and which thus can either educate or spiritualise the masses.

The solution offered by those who say, 'Reform the Church,' remains for examination.

These, like the religious liberationists, are anxious that the instrument for spiritualising life should be effective. But the Reformers recognise that this, the highest object of any organisation, is also the object of the State, and can only be attained by means of the Constitution. Individuals may be left to provide for the wants they have recognised. But the State must provide for the wants of the higher life and send out teachers to tell individuals of things beyond their ken. The Church reformers urge, therefore, that the principle of Establishment should be retained, but that abuses should be eradicated and old-fashioned methods reformed.

The practical difficulties of reform are doubtless many, but they are not insuperable. Inasmuch as Burke has said, 'What is taught by a State Church must be decided by the State, and not by the clergy,' it is possible to conceive that the nation, and not a sect, might determine how truth should be sought and taught. Inasmuch as now it is the people who directly or indirectly appoint their rulers, it is easy to conceive how the people, and not a patron, might have a voice in the choice of the parson, and how the parishioners, and not the parson, might govern the Church and the parish. There need be no ill-paid, no over-paid, no unworthy incumbent. There need be no neglected parish, and a State Church might be as effective an organisation for promoting spirituality as the State Post-office is for promoting intercourse.

Institutions have survived a greater reform than that which is required in the Church, and those who have seen the
changes which the law-making department of the State has endured may without fear submit the right-making department to like changes.

It is no new principle to reform the Reformed Church. By a law of Henry VIII. the king has authority to ' reform, correct all errors, heresies and abuses,' and the people's Parliament now takes the place of the king. 'The particular form of Divine worship,' says the preface to Edward VI.'s second Prayer Book, 'and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, &c. &c.' The Long Parliament changed the whole Constitution and Ritual of the Church. The Restoration Parliament undid that work. Throughout the seventeenth century the Teaching, the Ritual, and the Organisation were discussed as open questions, and the present system is the result purely of a Parliamentary decision.

Three hundred years ago, to suit the new age, the new birth of learning, the Church was reformed. The present times are marked by changes as great as those of the Renaissance, and the Church remains unchanged. As was the Church of the sixteenth century, so is the Church of the nineteenth century.

The government of England has become popular, and the people elect the Parliament which makes the laws; the Church of England is still exclusive, and the clergy in 'their' churches and 'their' parishes are still supreme.

Freedom has destroyed monopolies; and, according to a rough scale, justice is equally administered. In the Church, monopolies still exist, justice is defied in arrangements which are for the benefit of the strong, and the clergy are a 'protected' class.

The language and the fashion of Englishmen have changed, but the Church still addresses men with the language and the ritual of the Middle Ages.

The Church, long ago reformed to suit new needs, the rites of which are 'alterable,' has not been made to suit the needs of
modern times. The Church must be again reformed. If
details be asked as to the Constitution of the Church of the
future, if questions rise to men's lips, 'What will be done about
bishops?' 'Who will fix the limits of doctrine?' 'How
will the rights of minorities be considered?' the simple answer
is that all can be settled by the people. The Reformers of
1882 did not map out the details of the new government of
England; they simply gave the power to the people, and the
people rooted out abuses and reformed the administration of
law. It will be sufficient to-day if the people are admitted to
that place in Church government which is now usurped by the
clergy or their nominees.

The State is democratic, the Church must also be democ-
tratic. As the State is governed by the people for the
people, the Church must be governed by the people for the
people.

It is waste of time to make a paper constitution, which
often binds the hopes of its makers to one plan. Church
boards, a popular veto on patronage, or a general synod, may
be the best means of introducing the people's power, but it is
not wise to proceed as if the means were ends. Church re-
formers need not advocate any means as essential, the one
thing essential is to give the people power to form their own
Church; to see, in a word, that the Church is the people's
Church.

The obstacle to Church reform is not the doubt as to its
possibility or a difference of opinion as to its method. The
real obstacle is the general indifference to religion. The zeal
or enthusiasm which passes as religious is most often roused
by opinions, and, as Wesley said, 'Zeal for opinions is not
zeal for religion.' In the noise of controversy and in the
hurry of trade the very nature of religion seems forgotten.
The arguments of theologians and the sensationalism of
revivalists are discussed as religious problems, in which it is
well to show an intelligent interest, but men do not feel that
their daily lives, the lives of the poor, and the hope of England
depend on their relation with God. If it were really seen that
it is on religion, that is, on keeping up the communication between the little good within and the great good without, between man’s broken light and God’s full light, that trade, happiness, and life depend; if it were seen that England cannot be virtuous till Englishmen drink of the Fountain of virtue, then Church reform would be undertaken without delay. No difficulty would seem too great to prevent the vast resources of the Church being brought to the service of religion, and the highest intelligence of statesmen would be devoted to making perfect the organisation for spiritualising life.

It may not be in the power of those of less intelligence to tell the method of reform, but all who are weary at the thought of the present condition of the people may refresh themselves with hopes. Those who reflect on the cheerless faces so common to East London, the dull, weary round of the workers, their dreadful life and their hopeless death, are borne down by the thought that each one of these lives in the parish of some Church minister. They weary themselves wondering how the servant provided by the State might better serve the needs of the poor, how the great Church organisation might eradicate unfit houses, bring wealth to the relief of poverty, and make the means of joy more equal. They ask themselves in vain how the house of God might be a house for God’s children. Unable to answer, they may at any rate gladden themselves with an ideal.

The People’s Church then may be so close to the best thought of the nation that it will reflect that thought in every parish, as the ministers who have gathered light from the greatest teachers of science and history direct that light on the lives of the hardest workers. It may be so near to every individual that its buildings will be the meeting place of all, the scene of the Holy Communion, where men will learn to know and love God and man. It may so bring together rich and poor, the cultured and the ignorant, that the efforts and the money now fitfully wasted by rival philanthropists will be directed to the effectual remedy of ignorance and poverty. The ministers of the People’s Church may be near to God and
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or to men, a means by which the avenues to the highest kept open, the spiritual teachers who, by their lives and
poisons, touch the divine within the human, and make all
respond to the call of right and duty, and settle life on
a calm.

The conception of such a Church is possible, though it is
possible to say how it may be accomplished; or how these
competing claims of creeds and rituals to be religion may be
satisfied; or how the rights of men and the rights of their little
items may be sunk in the thought of duty. The organ-
ization of the Church of the future is not now to be sketched.
The first step which it is for this generation to take has been
made clear. All progress has been through the people, and
the Church must be in fact, as in name, the people’s Church.
There must be a parish parliament and not a parish despot,
and the government of the Church must be by the people as
well as for the people.

This is the first step, and what will follow is in God’s
purposes. It is the people who govern the nation and decide
peace or war. They have moulded the machinery by
which justice is administered and freedom secured; the people
must also mould the machinery by which right will be taught
and life spiritualized. If they are excluded from exercising
their will upon the Establishment, nothing can hinder them
from destroying it. God speaks in every age; He has not
forgotten to be gracious, and the people are now His instru-
ments, as in old days were kings. It is by them His will is
being done, and in that belief the people may be trusted so to
order the Church that by its means the Holy Spirit will once
more show among men the fruit of virtue and honesty.

SAMUEL A. BARNETT.
THE CHURCH AND LABOUR DISPUTE

The Medieval Church dreamed of being a universal peacemaker, when the Pope would settle in his court questions between kings or nations. The Churches of to-day are haunted by the same dream. Each little flock hopes to inherit the kingdom, and its ministers aspire to settle questions between labour and capital. Things in dreams are not as they seem, but dreams now, as in old times, have their interpretations, and are sometimes guides to truth. The Churches may, perhaps, help to solve the labour problems, but not by putting up their ministers to hear evidence and to give judgment. Their part is rather to teach than to judge, and to give than to take evidence.

The public is the only potentate who can fill the place which the Pope grasped, and from its opinion there is no appeal. It is for the Churches (1) so to inspire the public that its judgment will be sound, and (2) then to offer the evidence on which it may exercise that judgment.

(1) The chief duty of the Churches to the world is to set forward an ideal of life, to draw out admiration for noble, generous, and honest conduct, and to show the penalties which surely follow all forms of lying and selfishness. This duty has special applications, according as different subjects arise for the judgment of the public.

The labour problems, the rate of wages, the length of the working day, the rights of trades unions, the treatment of the unskilled, the weak and the old, press for settlement.

1 Reprinted by permission from the Review of the Churches.
A man once came to Christ, saying: 'Command my brother that he divide the inheritance with me.' If labour and capital are to the Churches, urging that they command a different division of profits, the answer of the Churches must be 'Who made me a judge or a divider for you? Beware of covetousness.' It is covetousness on both sides which hinders the solution of the labour problems, and the special duty of the Churches at the present juncture is to convince both capitalists and labourers of the covetousness which, like the proverbial mote in the eye, prevents fair judgment of others. David could not believe that he was a man who had taken a poor neighbour's one ewe lamb, and there are thousands of upright capitalists who would not believe that they are spoilers, and thousands of well-disposed labourers whom covetousness has so blinded that they say of every capitalist, as Satan said of Job, 'Doth he serve God for nought?'

A few years ago the dock directors took credit to themselves because their system afforded a chance job to men who had lost their characters; they were content to let a hungry crowd fight morning after morning like wild beasts around the dock gates; they were content, knowing that the few pence earned each week could not support life; they were blinded by covetousness. At present manufacturers think themselves justified in polluting the air which must be breathed by thousands of their fellow-citizens, in employing women under conditions destructive to health, and in giving wages quite inadequate for the support of old age. They say such things are necessary to secure the interest on capital, and they spend on hospitals, on 'handfuls of coal and rice,' and poor rates as much money as would have enabled the people to provide necessaries for themselves. They say it is wrong to reduce the return on capital, and do not see it is wrong to degrade human beings. They regard '4 or 5 per cent.' as something sacred, and they do not see that Trade Unionism may be also sacred, and they give as 'charity' what
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty. They justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of ‘imperial’ questions so long as ‘wages’ questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. ‘What,’ said a speaker at a debate, ‘was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.’ They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy ‘sweated’ clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. ‘Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,’ is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. ‘The nearer, the severer,’ is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make ‘too much of interest and too little of passions.’ They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
gious disappointment may all be healed by higher wages, better drainage, and good order. Their own covetousness makes them exaggerate the covetousness of the Indians.

In the same way the alienation of labour and capital, the like shown by the agricultural labourers for kindly squires and honest parsons, the anger of employers against humane statesmen, are due to the fact that each side, being covetous, is treated the other side as if it were covetous and nothing more.

Labour and capital think too much of interest and not enough of passion in dealing with one another. Conscious of being human, with human wants and hopes, each resents being rated as if interests were supreme; the labourer resents the tempt to buy him with a gift, while he is denied a voice in the parish council, and the employer knows the agitator does no wrong when he says that the only way of making him eat is through his pocket.

The public whose opinion has ultimately to settle the labour problems is made up of capitalists and labourers. To the public, therefore, the Churches must repeat Christ’s message. Their ministers must show the failure of covetousness to cause havoc it works in character, the misery, the poverty it brings in its train. But, chiefly, they must hold up for imitation that human life which makes everyone who is human turn from greed as from something foreign to his humanity. They will thus fit the public to decide between labour and capital.

(2) Their second duty is to present the facts on which judgment is to be formed. The Labour Commission is in one sense a reproach to the Churches; there ought to have been no need to discover by special inquiry how labour lives, is paid, and organises itself. The Churches of Christ exist that they may follow Christ, bring to light things which are hidden, and unite in one flock the many folds. If, when employers are charged with making a full life impossible for the labourers, they urge, ‘We never knew,’ and if, when labourers are charged with bringing lying accusations against the employers and
England the strongest of the sects. In a short time one of the parties now held in union within the Establishment would obtain the supremacy, and that party would inherit all the power and prestige of the position. This party—being only a section of the religious body—would pose as the representative of religion, and its clergy would identify their interests with the interest of God. Again, there would be some Becket to oppose the will of Parliament, and to call some law affecting his order 'irreligious,' and a clericalism would be let loose to assume, and perhaps make hateful, the name of religion. 'Clericalism is the enemy of men,' is a saying which has much truth in it. The pity is if clericalism and religion are enabled to seem to be the same thing.

Disestablishment, finally, would intensify the competition of sects. To make one proselyte, the supporters of various forms would compass sea and land. The standard of morality would be lowered, and the flags of doctrine, invented out of will-worship, would be waved to bring in rich adherents, and get the use of their money. Even, as it is, there is no need to go far to find work, which would fall to pieces if the preacher spoke the truth to the subscribers about their private life or their tempers. It is urged that the congregations in American non-established Churches are large; it is not urged that the people in America are above bribery in politics or above cheating in trade. It is not urged that American social life is spiritualised, and that is the only fact which would be evidence of the good of the system.

To sum up the case against those who offer Disestablishment of the Church as an answer to the question, 'How is the nation to be brought into union with the spirit of goodness?' it may be urged that—

1. Disestablishment is a destructive and wasteful method of getting rid of abuses, and would destroy the power of the State to teach what the State holds to be truth.

2. Disestablishment would establish clericalism, a force which more than once in history has made religion hateful, and roused for its repression the God-fearing men of the nation.
8. Disestablishment, trusting to competition, would leave poor neighbourhoods unhelped. A poor congregation could not hope for a church in which worship should be stirred by the beauty of sight and sound. An ignorant population would not exert itself to get either a church or a teacher. The most needy would thus be the most neglected. It is only the State which can give with equal hand to all its members, and which thus can either educate or spiritualise the masses.

The solution offered by those who say, 'Reform the Church,' remains for examination.

These, like the religious liberationists, are anxious that the instrument for spiritualising life should be effective. But the Reformers recognise that this, the highest object of any organisation, is also the object of the State, and can only be attained by means of the Constitution. Individuals may be left to provide for the wants they have recognised. But the State must provide for the wants of the higher life and send out teachers to tell individuals of things beyond their ken. The Church reformers urge, therefore, that the principle of Establishment should be retained, but that abuses should be eradicated and old-fashioned methods reformed.

The practical difficulties of reform are doubtless many, but they are not insuperable. Inasmuch as Burke has said, 'What is taught by a State Church must be decided by the State, and not by the clergy,' it is possible to conceive that the nation, and not a sect, might determine how truth should be sought and taught. Inasmuch as now it is the people who directly or indirectly appoint their rulers, it is easy to conceive how the people, and not a patron, might have a voice in the choice of the parson, and how the parishioners, and not the parson, might govern the Church and the parish. There need be no ill-paid, no over-paid, no unworthy incumbent. There need be no neglected parish, and a State Church might be as effective an organisation for promoting spirituality as the State Post-office is for promoting intercourse.

Institutions have survived a greater reform than that which is required in the Church, and those who have seen the
on the side of capital, and there are churches whose members are on the side of labour, and the teaching of the minister gets a bias from the members. The buildings do not afford common meeting-place for rich and poor, nor the meetings means of communion which would make one help the other. They are, indeed, often symbols of division rather than of union and the ‘West End’ church, with its luxuries of warmth, colour, sound, and eloquent preaching, has little in common with the ‘East End’ Church. The very charities of which the Church boast are signs of their failure to create the charity which comes by knowledge. The rich give not as to brothers and sisters, but as to ‘masses’ who can be satisfied with pen-dinners, old clothes, and shelters.

The Churches have not educated public opinion to beware of covetousness or to understand the facts of life. They have often rather themselves illustrated the force of covetousness. They have introduced class distinctions into places of worship and have made charity a barrier and not a bond. They still, however, hold the field as educators, and with them it large rests to solve the labour problems. They are still supreme in many departments of life, and each Church can show a record of work which must command attention. They are still the outward expression of the small voice which speaks in every man, and they still bear in them the marks of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Churches (or, as I would rather say, the Church) are therefore powerful, and when they make their buildings meeting-houses of rich and poor, their highest service a communion, and their chief doctrine the preaching of Christ, they may so educate public opinion as to settle for ever, on stronger foundation than on a decision of an arbitrator, even on a law, the rate of wages and the hours of labour.

Samuel A. Barnett.
modern times. The Church must be again reformed. If details be asked as to the Constitution of the Church of the future, if questions rise to men’s lips, ‘What will be done about bishops?’ ‘Who will fix the limits of doctrine?’ ‘How will the rights of minorities be considered?’ the simple answer is that all can be settled by the people. The Reformers of 1862 did not map out the details of the new government of England; they simply gave the power to the people, and the people rooted out abuses and reformed the administration of law. It will be sufficient to-day if the people are admitted to that place in Church government which is now usurped by the clergy or their nominees.

The State is democratic, the Church must also be democratic. As the State is governed by the people for the people, the Church must be governed by the people for the people.

It is waste of time to make a paper constitution, which often binds the hopes of its makers to one plan. Church boards, a popular veto on patronage, or a general synod, may be the best means of introducing the people’s power, but it is not wise to proceed as if the means were ends. Church reformers need not advocate any means as essential, the one thing essential is to give the people power to form their own Church; to see, in a word, that the Church is the people’s Church.

The obstacle to Church reform is not the doubt as to its possibility or a difference of opinion as to its method. The real obstacle is the general indifference to religion. The zeal or enthusiasm which passes as religious is most often roused by opinions, and, as Wesley said, ‘Zeal for opinions is not zeal for religion.’ In the noise of controversy and in the hurry of trade the very nature of religion seems forgotten. The arguments of theologians and the sensationalism of revivalists are discussed as religious problems, in which it is well to show an intelligent interest, but men do not feel that their daily lives, the lives of the poor, and the hope of England depend on their relation with God. If it were really seen that
it is on religion, that is, on keeping up the communication between the little good within and the great good without, between man’s broken light and God’s full light, that trade, happiness, and life depend; if it were seen that England cannot be virtuous till Englishmen drink of the Fountain of virtue, then Church reform would be undertaken without delay. No difficulty would seem too great to prevent the vast resources of the Church being brought to the service of religion, and the highest intelligence of statesmen would be devoted to making perfect the organisation for spiritualising life.

It may not be in the power of those of less intelligence to tell the method of reform, but all who are weary at the thought of the present condition of the people may refresh themselves with hopes. Those who reflect on the cheerless faces so common to East London, the dull, weary round of the workers, their dreadful life and their hopeless death, are borne down by the thought that each one of these lives in the parish of some Church minister. They weary themselves wondering how the servant provided by the State might better serve the needs of the poor, how the great Church organisation might eradicate unfit houses, bring wealth to the relief of poverty, and make the means of joy more equal. They ask themselves in vain how the house of God might be a house for God’s children. Unable to answer, they may at any rate gladden themselves with an ideal.

The People’s Church then may be so close to the best thought of the nation that it will reflect that thought in every parish, as the ministers who have gathered light from the greatest teachers of science and history direct that light on to the lives of the hardest workers. It may be so near to every individual that its buildings will be the meeting place of all, the scene of the Holy Communion, where men will learn to know and love God and man. It may so bring together rich and poor, the cultured and the ignorant, that the efforts and the money now fitfully wasted by rival philanthropists will be directed to the effectual remedy of ignorance and poverty. The ministers of the People’s Church may be near to God and
are in the strong tones of action that bread-stealing is more wicked than wife-beating? Or is the highest life made possible by laws that allow so much of our great mother-God-blessed for the use of mankind—to be reserved the exclusive benefit and enjoyment of the upper classes?

4. Division of Classes.—Love is the strongest force in the universe. At least the ancient teachers thought so when they named God, and left Him with the Christian name of Love. Yet the teacher who preached the gospel of love enunciated the doctrine of eternal damnation of the great majority of mankind. But love, a certain kind of love for which no other love has ever been a substitute, becomes impossible by the great division between classes. We cannot love what we do not know; it is as the American said, ‘Oh, Jones! I hate that fellow.’ ‘Hate him?’ said his friend; ‘why, I did not think you knew him.’ ‘No, don’t,’ was the reply; ‘if I did, I guess I shouldn’t hate him.’ The division between classes is a wrong to both classes. The poor lose something by their ignorance of the grace, the care, and the wider interest of the rich; the rich lose far more by their ignorance of the patience, the meekness, the self-consciousness, the self-sacrifice, and the great strength of the poor.

5. Besides these conditions, others exist, forming barriers hindering a man from leading his true life, such as want of light, space, and beauty. The sunrise is to a large number of town dwellers only an intimation—and rarely an agreeable one—that they must get out of bed. It is but the lighting of the lamp, and not, as Blake said, the rising of an innumerable company of the heavenly host consecrating the day to duty by singing, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty.’ And even there is space to see the sky, there is still the absence of sure to watch its unhurried changes. We all haste and shun, we hurry and drive. The very parlance of the day opts new words to express despatch; and one dear old body whom I know, who is sixty years old and of appropriate proportions, constantly informs me that she ‘flew’ hither and thither—a method of locomotion which, in earlier years, I
THE CHURCH AND LABOUR DISPUTE

The Medieval Church dreamed of being a universal peacemaker, when the Pope would settle in his court questions between kings or nations. The Churches of to-day are haunted by the same dream. Each little flock hopes to inherit the kingdom, and its ministers aspire to settle questions between labour and capital. Things in dreams are not as they seem, but dreams now, as in old times, have their interpretations, and are sometimes guides to truth. The Churches may, perhaps, help to solve the labour problems, but not by putting up their ministers to hear evidence and to give judgment. Their part is rather to teach than to judge, and to give than to take evidence.

The public is the only potentate who can fill the place at which the Pope grasped, and from its opinion there is no appeal. It is for the Churches (1) so to inspire the public that its judgment will be sound, and (2) then to offer the evidence on which it may exercise that judgment.

(1) The chief duty of the Churches to the world is to set forward an ideal of life, to draw out admiration for noble, generous, and honest conduct, and to show the penalties which surely follow all forms of lying and selfishness. This duty has special applications, according as different subjects arise for the judgment of the public.

The labour problems, the rate of wages, the length of the working day, the rights of trades unions, the treatment of the unskilled, the weak and the old, press for settlement.

1 Reprinted by permission from the Review of the Churches.
doubt about it that our friend is a very fine fellow), still there are flaws both in his past and present constitution and character which make his work less effective than it otherwise might be. Briefly, his heart is not large enough for his body; his circulation is slow—his movements are ponderous—and, though slightly hard of hearing, he does not take in things until he lives little after other people have done so. Then, too, is somewhat a creature of habit; his mind does not readily imitate new ideas, and he does rather an unusual number of things because 'he always has done so.' His raison d'etre, whole work, is founded on the first word of his name—sanity (which the new translators tell us we may call love, we like)—and yet he is sometimes curiously persistent in thinking evil,' and he hardly, I fear, 'hopeth all things,' nor lives up to his standard of 'never failing'; or what does 8 cases thrown aside as 'undeserving and ineligible' mean this last month's returns of work?

Then he has an odd way of talking about his work. I have often seen ordinary, commonplace, every-day sort of people begin to listen to him with keen interest, but gradually drop eyelids and lose sympathy as he threads his way through investigations, organisations, registrations, co-operations, applications, administrations, each and all done by multiplication!

This is a pity, for of course the every-day sort of people most wanted to help him. He cannot only work with people who have been cradled in blue-books and nourished with statistics, nor yet with those who are like the man who did not care to look unless he could see the future.'

Some people dislike this faulty creature very much. They are no good in him, and call him all sorts of hard names; but then one is apt to find faults in large people more unbearable than in little ones. Clumsy people, if big, are so very clumsy; they tumble over the furniture, and kick the pet dog; and if they do chance to tread on toes, it hurts so very much! and that is partly the case with him. But he has virtues, and plenty of them; he is not afraid of work, and he really cares for the poor; he is exceedingly honourable about money; he
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of ‘imperial’ questions so long as ‘wages’ questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. ‘What,’ said a speaker at a debate, ‘was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.’ They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy ‘sweated’ clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. ‘Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,’ is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. ‘The nearer, the severer,’ is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make ‘too much of interest and too little of passions.’ They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
And why is the case ineligible? Because the Committee think that money will do the family no good. The people below the stage when money help can be useful. They have drifted till they are, in fact, ineligible for what the society, materialistic as the age which counts money the greatest god, feels itself alone able to give, and by the decision of the committee they are allowed to drift still. And yet not one of us could say that this family did not need help. On the one side a paper, in the very middle of the first page, stands two appallable facts. Williamson is only casually employed by a great permanent company. Williamson is in no club.

Charitable effort needs organising even more than charitable relief. Some people fear the devil more than they love God; in other words, they fear to do harm more than they love to do good. Seeing that money unwisely bestowed does great harm, they have hastened to organise it, neglecting meanwhile to organise effort, which for the creation of good is stronger than money for the creation of evil.

Williamson, with his rough, decent wife and his three unkempt children, is, let us grant, ineligible for charitable relief, but not for charitable effort. That might be directed to induce him to belong to a club, to take intelligent interest in the actions of his country, to realise, helped by Sir Walter Scott or Tourgenieff, the thoughts of other nations, the character of other centuries or classes. Let effort be used to help him to accept the strength which union gives to resistance, be it to personal temptation or to public wrong.

And could not charitable effort undertake that Mrs. Williamson’s tiring day be less degradingly tiring? Could it not provide a cozy parlour-club, or a chair more tempting than an upright Windsor, in which darning and mending would be possible? And perhaps that dull task would not be so wholly distasteful if enlivened by a sweet voice, who would read ideas into the stitches, or sing patches into rhythmical relations. Such effort would soon make a difference in the unkempt appearance of the little Williamsonsons, and maybe evenings
England the strongest of the sects. In a short time one of
the parties now held in union within the Establishment would
obtain the supremacy, and that party would inherit all the
power and prestige of the position. This party—being only a
section of the religious body—would pose as the representative
of religion, and its clergy would identify their interests with
the interest of God. Again, there would be some Becket to
oppose the will of Parliament, and to call some law affecting
his order 'irreligious,' and a clericalism would be let loose to
assume, and perhaps make hateful, the name of religion.
"Clericalism is the enemy of men," is a saying which has much
truth in it. The pity is if clericalism and religion are enabled
to seem to be the same thing.

Disestablishment, finally, would intensify the competition
of sects. To make one proselyte, the supporters of various
forms would compass sea and land. The standard of morality
would be lowered, and the flags of doctrine, invented out of
will-worship, would be waved to bring in rich adherents, and
get the use of their money. Even, as it is, there is no need
to go far to find work, which would fall to pieces if the preacher
spoke the truth to the subscribers about their private life or
their tempers. It is urged that the congregations in American
non-established Churches are large; it is not urged that the
people in America are above bribery in politics or above cheat-
ing in trade. It is not urged that American social life is
spiritualised, and that is the only fact which would be evidence
of the good of the system.

To sum up the case against those who offer Disestablish-
ment of the Church as an answer to the question, 'How is
the nation to be brought into union with the spirit of good-
ness?' it may be urged that—

1. Disestablishment is a destructive and wasteful method
of getting rid of abuses, and would destroy the power of the
State to teach what the State holds to be truth.

2. Disestablishment would establish clericalism, a force
which more than once in history has made religion hateful,
and roused for its repression the God-fearing men of the nation.
uld be sent with time and tact who would help the poor
low to other pleasures than those of regretful memories;
we read she was 'well-to-do in her husband's lifetime,'
me one who would make bright half-hours for her and take
mind from dwelling on her poor painful face, guiding her
draw strength from the thought of other lives and hope
of greater interests.
Is not some one's carriage at the society's disposal in
which she may be taken—she is too weak to walk, and has not
en out for two and a half years—to catch a glimpse of the
ight spring flowers and the new-budding trees?
For the boy too. He may be in a good place and earn
ough for bare necessities; but he has not the means of get-
books, the opportunities for joining a gymnasium, nor
knowledge of the club, where he could be re-created and
rm friendships. These may all be within reach, and would
urtainly be for the relief of such a lad's hard and monotonous
le; but the Charity Organisation Society, declaring that he
es 'not require relief,' lets him go without an effort to give
m what would influence his life far more radically than the
sked for half-a-crown a week.
And for the girl also. She may be training for good work,
but she must often be tired of the drudgery of her five years'
ursing done without the help of a competent doctor—for the
old lady 'doctors of herself'—and done, too, between the
ntervals allowed by her business of widow-cap making. Does
he require no relief which the Charity Organisation Society
an give—the relief which comes through books and patience-
taching pictures, the relief which follows the introduction
the singing class leading to the choir, or which comes
rough the hand-grasp of the wiser friend when the road is
usually drear?
Relief through such agencies would often make later
elief unnecessary—relief which we dare not withhold, and
et ache as we silently give it to lock hospitals, reformatories,
nd penitentiaries. Might not—may not charitable effort be
organised to remove some of the social conditions which stand
changes which the law-making department of the State has ensured may without fear submit the right-making department to like changes.

It is a new principle to reform the Reformed Church. By a law of Henry VIII., the king has authority to ‘reform, correct all errors, heresies and abuses,’ and the people’s Parliament now takes the place of the king. ‘The particular form of Divine worship’ says the preface to Edward VI.’s second Prayer Book, ‘and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein being in their own nature indifferent and alternative, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, &c., &c.’ The Long Parliament changed the whole Constitution and Ritual of the Church. The Restoration Parliament undid that work. Throughout the seventeenth century the Teaching, the Ritual, and the Organisation were discussed as open questions, and the present system is the result purely of a Parliamentary decision.

Three hundred years ago, to suit the new age, the new birth of learning, the Church was reformed. The present times are marked by changes as great as those of the Renaissance, and the Church remains unchanged. As was the Church of the sixteenth century, so is the Church of the nineteenth century.

The government of England has become popular, and the people elect the Parliament which makes the laws; the Church of England is still exclusive, and the clergy in their churches and their parishes are still supreme.

Freedom has destroyed monopolies; and, according to a rough scale, justice is equally administered. In the Church, monopolies still exist, justice is defied in arrangements which are for the benefit of the strong, and the clergy are a protected class.

The language and the fashion of Englishmen have changed, but the Church still addresses men with the language and the ritual of the Middle Ages.

The Church, long ago reformed to suit new needs, the rites of which are ‘alterable,’ has not been made to suit the needs of
CHARITABLE EFFORT

Can return and drink for our pleasure the wine which might be his health? Which of us, having become acquainted with the low ideas, the coarse thoughts, the unholy ones of (pardon the expression) the 'outcast poor,' can reject the privilege of self-sacrifice for their help; can neglect, at the best of any personal trouble, a single effort which will aid their 'growth in grace'?

Evil is wrought from ignorance as well as want of thought; and the rich suffer from not knowing, as much as the poor from not being known. Both classes want help. They cannot one break down their barriers, and alone they cannot live their best life. Our society must help them—our society, guided by wise rules as to what not to do, can introduce, as the children say, Mr. Too-Much to Miss Too-Little; it can be the 'Helpful Society,' helping the man stifled with too much; helping the man starving with too little; helping the idler whose true nature is literally 'dying for something to do'; helping the worker who seeks the grave gladly from fatigue; helping the lonely man to find his place in the crowd, and the crowd-tired man to opportunities of solitude; helping the owner of knowledge to outpour his treasures, and the ignorant to receive the same; helping the merrymaker to make merry, and the sorrowful to teach the lessons of pain; helping those who have found the true meaning of life to ring out their news to those of us who are still groping and restless for assurance; helping, in short, all who will give effort to wise uses.

Practically the thirty-nine district offices might each be the centre of all those forces which, under any name, are directed against the evils and hardships of life. Their rooms might be the places in which the members of charitable societies would hold their meetings. And, instead of dreading association with the Charity Organisation Society, all honest workers might hope to find in connection with it associates the most helpful. One day the committee-room would be occupied by a Relief Society, which would make its grants; another day would find ladies gathered to consult on some
it is on religion, that is, on keeping up the communication between the little good within and the great good without, between man's broken light and God's full light, that trade, happiness, and life depend; if it were seen that England cannot be virtuous till Englishmen drink of the Fountain of virtue, then Church reform would be undertaken without delay. No difficulty would seem too great to prevent the vast resources of the Church being brought to the service of religion, and the highest intelligence of statesmen would be devoted to making perfect the organisation for spiritualising life.

It may not be in the power of those of less intelligence to tell the method of reform, but all who are weary at the thought of the present condition of the people may refresh themselves with hopes. Those who reflect on the cheerless faces so common to East London, the dull, weary round of the workers, their dreadful life and their hopeless death, are borne down by the thought that each one of these lives in the parish of some Church minister. They weary themselves wondering how the servant provided by the State might better serve the needs of the poor, how the great Church organisation might eradicate unfit houses, bring wealth to the relief of poverty, and make the means of joy more equal. They ask themselves in vain how the house of God might be a house for God's children. Unable to answer, they may at any rate gladden themselves with an ideal.

The People's Church then may be so close to the best thought of the nation that it will reflect that thought in every parish, as the ministers who have gathered light from the greatest teachers of science and history direct that light on to the lives of the hardest workers. It may be so near to every individual that its buildings will be the meeting place of all, the scene of the Holy Communion, where men will learn to know and love God and man. It may so bring together rich and poor, the cultured and the ignorant, that the efforts and the money now fitfully wasted by rival philanthropists will be directed to the effectual remedy of ignorance and poverty. The ministers of the People's Church may be near to God and
near to men, a means by which the avenues to the highest are kept open, the spiritual teachers who, by their lives and doctrines, touch the divine within the human, and make all men respond to the call of right and duty, and settle life on eternal calm.

The conception of such a Church is possible, though it is not possible to say how it may be accomplished; or how these competing claims of creeds and rituals to be religion may be satisfied; or how the rights of men and the rights of their little systems may be sunk in the thought of duty. The organisation of the Church of the future is not now to be sketched. The first step which it is for this generation to take has been made clear. All progress has been through the people, and the Church must be in fact, as in name, the people's Church. There must be a parish parliament and not a parish despot, and the government of the Church must be by the people as well as for the people.

This is the first step, and what will follow is in God's counsels. It is the people who govern the nation and decide on peace or war. They have moulded the machinery by which justice is administered and freedom secured; the people must also mould the machinery by which right will be taught and life spiritualised. If they are excluded from exercising their will upon the Establishment, nothing can hinder them from destroying it. God speaks in every age; He has not forgotten to be gracious, and the people are now His instruments, as in old days were kings. It is by them His will is being done, and in that belief the people may be trusted so to order the Church that by its means the Holy Spirit will once more show among men the fruit of virtue and honesty.

Samuel A. Barnett.
WHAT GIRLS CAN DO TO HUSH 'THE BITTER CRY' \footnote{A Paper read at a meeting summoned by the Metropolitan Society of Voluntary Workers.}

The instinct of helpfulness is strong in us all, but hardly stronger anywhere than in the hearts of girls. Girls between eighteen and twenty-one, full of health, fresh from school with minds alive by effort, interests undulled by experience, they are ready to enter life—life in the full acceptance of the word—and they are, as a rule, offered only one side of the great ball, and that the part which cannot be taken alone, namely, pleasure. ‘They are young; let them enjoy themselves,’ say the loving mothers and indulgent elders; but how many a girl her own enjoyment is but a poor substitute for what she feels might be her better life, and so she sometimes takes to pleasure recklessly and in undue proportion; or else frets against her lot, often refusing—because she cannot have her share of the more earnest side of life—the wholesome enjoyment which follows its pleasures.

On the other hand (and who, knowing the ugly pains and sins in the world, can wonder) the careful mother spares no pains to protect and guard her child from contact with such things. Over and over again one hears a parent say, ‘I wanted to take a district, but I could not let her face the things she might meet there.’ And with these tender mothers I heartily sympathise, but none the less so with the would-be helpful daughters.

It is about the work which can be done by girls with...
ming the risks of meeting harmful wrong that I am going speak.

For simplicity's sake, let me divide it into two groups—
work which can be done at home, and work which can be done outside.

For home work there is sewing; and lately there has been going in East London a clothing club on rather a new plan. Instead of meeting for an afternoon's needlework, the workers agree to make two, three, four, or six garments in a month, according to the time, capacity, &c., at their disposal. The clothes, already cut out, are sent to each worker, who makes them at her leisure and returns them to the secretary the end of the month. Any girl can do this. It is dull, but helpful—distinctly helpful, as those of us who come face to face with the poor know; helpful to the pinched mother, no, no less careful of her daughter than the wealthy parent, adds 'no clothes' an insufferable barrier to getting her girl to 'good service'; helpful to the girl who does not want to 'and mix with the rough uns,' but who, unhelped, most must do so as long as social conditions, rate of wages, and the estimate of women be what they are.

Then there is painting. What shoals of Christmas cards all get, and what becomes of them? They might be made to dodos for the wards of workhouse schools. Those places, as a rule, drear and barren. The children have nothing to look at, and the pause-time of illness loses half its value because the well known walls have no bright ideas to give the empty brains, no grand thoughts taught through mottoes or inscriptions which may sink in and arise as watchwords in the future battle of life.

Any girl can arrange Christmas cards. The same cards in scrapbooks for the bedridden babes, if pasted on calico, and connected with painted flowers and sprays or quaint wood-work drawing, make admirable screens, or wall decoration as dadoes. They must be varnished if so used; but that need present no difficulty. The carpenter at the schools for which the gifts purposed will do that bit of technical work, and the same
holds good for mottoes. They can be put up if cut out and coloured, and it must be acknowledged that in all senses it is helpful work to make permanent and beautiful the great words of the greatest minds for the poverty-dulled brain of the orphan or deserted child—the 'nobody's bairn.'

As to doll-dressing, ball and toy making, they hardly need mentioning, except, perhaps, to say that the supply is nearly equal to the demand, and that the thousands of children hidden behind the tall even walls of our pauper-schools have, in spite of discipline, a most hungry love for dolls and toys, which loving hunger cannot be satisfied unless the little girls will be more industriously helpful at home.

But there is yet another way in which girls can help, poor from the home precincts, and inasmuch as it has to do direct with people and not things, it stands on a higher level than what has been before suggested. It is to welcome and entertain as friendship dictates one, two, or more friendly girls. What is a little scrub-ber-drub-drub-maid-of-all-work to do with her holidays; not too frequent, it is certain, coming as they do, once in three months?

'Why, Jane, it must be more than two months since you came to see me, isn't it?' I said to such a girl yesterday.

'Yes, mum, it's five months since I had a holiday; but then I've nowhere else to go to, only to come and see ye, and I didn't like to trouble you so often, so I haven't asked for a holiday.'

That remark made me feel ashamed. Five months since she had a holiday; and then what a one it was! to spend a day in Whitechapel, with its noise and bustle, depending on what I could hastily plan on such short notice for her pleasure.

Girls in the country may easily make holiday pleasure for girls in the town, helped by the Zoological Gardens, the park and the shops, could make such holidays glad, golden, growing days for their humbler sisters. Poor children! and how helpful they, too, would be. This same Jane brought me little bundle of children's clothes which she had made 'in t
religious disappointment may all be healed by higher wages, better drainage, and good order. Their own covetousness makes them exaggerate the covetousness of the Indians.

In the same way the alienation of labour and capital, the dislike shown by the agricultural labourers for kindly squires and honest parsons, the anger of employers against humane agitators, are due to the fact that each side, being covetous, has treated the other side as if it were covetous and nothing more.

Labour and capital think too much of interest and not enough of passion in dealing with one another. Conscious of being human, with human wants and hopes, each resents being treated as if interests were supreme; the labourer resents the attempt to buy him with a gift, while he is denied a voice in the parish council, and the employer knows the agitator does him wrong when he says that the only way of making him feel is through his pocket.

The public whose opinion has ultimately to settle the labour problems is made up of capitalists and labourers. To the public, therefore, the Churches must repeat Christ’s message. Their ministers must show the failure of covetousness, the havoc it works in character, the misery, the poverty it brings in its train. But, chiefly, they must hold up for admiration that human life which makes everyone who is human turn from greed as from something foreign to his humanity. They will thus fit the public to decide between labour and capital.

(2) Their second duty is to present the facts on which judgment is to be formed. The Labour Commission is in one sense a reproach to the Churches; there ought to have been no need to discover by special inquiry how labour lives, is paid, and organises itself. The Churches of Christ exist that they may follow Christ, bring to light things which are hidden, and unite in one flock the many folds. If, when employers are charged with making a full life impossible for the labourers, they urge, ‘We never knew,’ and if, when labourers are charged with bringing lying accusations against the employers and
of offers in this direction. Half-holidays are generally on
Wednesdays and Saturdays, and any girl would (I judge
from my own experience) be able to declare, after the first
shyness had worn off, that those play hours were really 'good
times.' The children in their bare yards, with little or nothing
to play with, heartily welcome a live, grown-up plaything, and
the small lessons in fairness, unselfishness, good temper, and
tenderness for the weaker or younger, come forcibly, and are
received graciously, from 'their dear lady, who makes such fun.'

Among the poor and sad there is such a dearth of pleasure
and play that a whole army of pleasure-creators and play-
makers could not meet all their needs. There are entertainers
wanted at parish and congregational parties—not people to
necessarily sing, play, and perform, but those who, in bright
gowns and with the halo which rest and refinement give in
the eyes of the work-worn and rough living, will mix among
them, making the picture-book interesting with gay chat, and
the game of some importance, because played against such a
keen opponent.

Then concerts can be got up, music can be given, and if
the performers will not require a giant hall and a crowded
audience, they will be able, perhaps, to give more pleasure, as
they gladden the mothers at their weekly meeting, or amuse
the men, resting after the day's labour, in the tobacco-charged
atmosphere of the Penny Club room.

Then there is teaching to be done, and this would specially
interest those girls who, having left school, still go on with
their education. There are pupil teachers to be read with,
and elder girls to instruct.

The pupil teachers, little groups belonging to each school,
varying from three to ten in number, could be invited after
their work is over, once a week for an hour or so, to read
books such as Ruskin's 'Sesame and Lilies,' or Carlyle's
'Sartor Resartus,' to learn French, or to be initiated into the
mysteries of the microscope. The routine work of a pupil
teacher is in itself dull, hard, and apt to crush out originality,
but it is really they who hold the future of the working classes
platform of the Church’s floor and looked into one another’s eyes at the Church’s conference or meeting, when they have met at one another’s houses and learnt, by what they see, how the others live, the employer will not any longer doubt that the workman has a mind, or the workman doubt that the employer has a heart.

The Churches by speech, in season and out of season, must teach the public how people live; they must give facts and figures, examples and instances. And, as knowledge comes by contact more than by hearsay, they must bring rich and poor together to enjoy the same pleasures, to discuss the same questions, to join in the same pursuits. They must in a very real sense make them neighbours before they can love others as they love themselves.

‘War comes,’ we are told, ‘by misunderstanding.’ This is true of the labour-war, and misunderstanding the Churches might do much to remove. Public opinion, inspired by a high ideal and instructed in the facts of life, would do most to settle the labour problems. It is indeed public opinion, and not force nor law, which largely fixes the rate of wages and the length of the working-day. English public opinion will not now allow workpeople to live as the Chinese live, or even to go barefoot. Public opinion might make it impossible for English workpeople to live without leisure for reading or recreation, without resources for health or travel, without room for decency or cleanliness, as it might make it impossible for English employers to surround themselves with luxuries, useless in the development of their own characters or in those of others.

The Churches have done much, but they have not educated public opinion in this direction. They have rather been ambitious, sometimes for the triumph of the doctrine they represent, sometimes for their ministers. They have seemed to the people to be anxious only to make proselytes, or to get a reputation of being peacemakers or arbitrators. ‘Advertising parsons and peripatetic philanthropists’ are the titles their ministers have earned. There are Churches whose members are
changes which the law-making department of the State has endured may without fear submit the right-making department to like changes.

It is no new principle to reform the Reformed Church. By a law of Henry VIII. the king has authority to 'reform, correct all errors, heresies and abuses,' and the people's Parliament now takes the place of the king. 'The particular form of Divine worship,' says the preface to Edward VI.'s second Prayer Book, 'and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, &c. &c.' The Long Parliament changed the whole Constitution and Ritual of the Church. The Restoration Parliament undid that work. Throughout the seventeenth century the Teaching, the Ritual, and the Organisation were discussed as open questions, and the present system is the result purely of a Parliamentary decision.

Three hundred years ago, to suit the new age, the new birth of learning, the Church was reformed. The present times are marked by changes as great as those of the Renaissance, and the Church remains unchanged. As was the Church of the sixteenth century, so is the Church of the nineteenth century.

The government of England has become popular, and the people elect the Parliament which makes the laws; the Church of England is still exclusive, and the clergy in 'their' churches and 'their' parishes are still supreme.

Freedom has destroyed monopolies; and, according to a rough scale, justice is equally administered. In the Church, monopolies still exist, justice is defied in arrangements which are for the benefit of the strong, and the clergy are a 'protected' class.

The language and the fashion of Englishmen have changed, but the Church still addresses men with the language and the ritual of the Middle Ages.

The Church, long ago reformed to suit new needs, the rites of which are 'alterable,' has not been made to suit the needs of
ime of sense, itself a sense to be worn with time; that men
umpet sorrows for mere love of noise and size, and become
antic over tales of sin to wring from each tale a new pleasure.
Sensationalism in social reform is either the outcome of self-
dulgence or it is the divine voice making itself heard in
language which he that runs may read.

Not lightly at any rate are Midlothian speeches, 'bitter-
ies,' and religious revivals to be passed over. They, by
prising and crying, by forcible statements and strong language,
ave caused public opinion to stop its course of easy satisfac-
tion and to express itself in new legislation. For the sake of the
bulgarians a Ministry was overturned; because of the cry of
the poor an Act of Parliament has been passed; and the success
f the Salvation Army has modified the services in our
urches. In face, though, of these results on legislation, and
f other results represented by various societies and leagues,
question still is, Will the same causes result in raising haracter?
Professor Clifford, in one of his essays, speaks
with religious fervour on the importance of character in
ociety:—

'Our words, our phrases, our forms and processes and modes
of thought are common property fashioned and perfected from
ge to age. . . . Into this, for good or ill, is woven every
belief of every man who has speech of his fellows. An awful
privilege and an awful responsibility, that we should help to
reate the world in which posterity will live!'

Further, he goes on to point out that a bad method is bad,
atever good results may follow, because it weakens the
haracter of the doer and so weakens society.

'If (he says) I steal money from any person, there may be
no harm done by the mere transfer of possession; he may
ot feel the loss, or it may prevent him from using the money
adly. But I cannot help doing this great wrong towards
Man, that I make myself dishonest. What hurts society is
ot that it should lose its property, but that it should become
eden of thieves; for then it must cease to be society. This
is why we ought not to do evil that good may come; for at
any rate this great evil has come, that we have done evil and are made wicked thereby.'

In judging, therefore, of methods of reform it is not enough to show that laws have been passed and leagues formed; it must also be shown that the character of all concerned is raised. Jesus drew few people after Him and died alone, but He so raised the character of man that His death inaugurated a permanent reformation of society. It is as the character of men is raised that all reforms become permanent.

Oppressed Nationalities depend for effectual help on the widely spread growth of sympathy with freedom; the poor will have starvation wages till the rich learn what justice requires and religion will fail to be a power till men are honest enough to ask themselves in what they do really believe. Methods of reform are valuable just in so far as they tend to increase sympathy, justice, honesty, reverence, and all the virtues of high character. The answer, therefore, as to the end of the striving and criers of modern philanthropy is to be found in the effects which such methods have on character.

On the side of sensationalism it is urged (1) that laws and institutions are great educators. By the many laws against theft thieving has come to be regarded as the great crime, and by societies such as that for the prevention of cruelty to animals kindness has come to be a common virtue. If, therefore, it is argued, by some rough awakening of the public conscience laws have been passed and institutions started, something done to develop the higher part of character. 'Principles,' has been said, 'are no more than moral habits,' and if agitation leads to laws which enforce moral habits, sensationalism may thus have the credit of forming principles which make character.

It is further urged (2) that, if association be the watchword of the future and the educational force of the new age, it is noisy means that associations must be formed, because a trumpet note which is to draw men together from those parts and classes between which great gulls are fixed must be loud enough to strike the senses.

Lastly, it is said (3) that many whose imagination l
near to men, a means by which the avenues to the highest are kept open, the spiritual teachers who, by their lives and doctrines, touch the divine within the human, and make all men respond to the call of right and duty, and settle life on eternal calm.

The conception of such a Church is possible, though it is not possible to say how it may be accomplished; or how these competing claims of creeds and rituals to be religion may be satisfied; or how the rights of men and the rights of their little systems may be sunk in the thought of duty. The organisation of the Church of the future is not now to be sketched. The first step which it is for this generation to take has been made clear. All progress has been through the people, and the Church must be in fact, as in name, the people's Church. There must be a parish parliament and not a parish despot, and the government of the Church must be by the people as well as for the people.

This is the first step, and what will follow is in God's counsels. It is the people who govern the nation and decide on peace or war. They have moulded the machinery by which justice is administered and freedom secured; the people must also mould the machinery by which right will be taught and life spiritualised. If they are excluded from exercising their will upon the Establishment, nothing can hinder them from destroying it. God speaks in every age; He has not forgotten to be gracious, and the people are now His instruments, as in old days were kings. It is by them His will is being done, and in that belief the people may be trusted so to order the Church that by its means the Holy Spirit will once more show among men the fruit of virtue and honesty.

Samuel A. Barnett.
THE CHURCH AND LABOUR DISPUTE

The Medieval Church dreamed of being a universal peacemaker, when the Pope would settle in his court questions between kings or nations. The Churches of to-day are haunted by the same dream. Each little flock hopes to inherit the kingdom, and its ministers aspire to settle questions between labour and capital. Things in dreams are not as they seem, but dreams now, as in old times, have their interpretations, and are sometimes guides to truth. The Churches may, perhaps, help to solve the labour problems, but not by putting up their ministers to hear evidence and to give judgment. Their part is rather to teach than to judge, and to give than to take evidence.

The public is the only potentate who can fill the place at which the Pope grasped, and from its opinion there is no appeal. It is for the Churches (1) so to inspire the public that its judgment will be sound, and (2) then to offer the evidence on which it may exercise that judgment.

(1) The chief duty of the Churches to the world is to set forward an ideal of life, to draw out admiration for noble, generous, and honest conduct, and to show the penalties which surely follow all forms of lying and selfishness. This duty has special applications, according as different subjects arise for the judgment of the public.

The labour problems, the rate of wages, the length of the working day, the rights of trades unions, the treatment of the unskilled, the weak and the old, press for settlement.

1 Reprinted by permission from the Review of the Churches.
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...ving Christianity better than the truth will proceed by loving his own sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all. A teetotaller will not add so much to society by his temperance as he will take away from it if his character becomes proud or narrow.

Party spirit—the spirit, that is, which is roused and mated by some hasty view of truth or right—is likely to make men unjust and cruel, and so a method of reform which produces this spirit cannot be approved. In the name of the randest causes, missionaries were in old times cruel, and philanthropists are in modern times often unjust.

Lastly, (3) those who have claimed that sensationalism has led to the passing of some useful law have been met by the paradox that laws and institutions rarely exist till they have ceased to be wanted. In England public opinion condemns cruelty to animals, and so a society has been created. In Egypt, where the need is greater, but where there is no public opinion to condemn the cruelty, there is no society. Certain it is, at any rate, that the statute-book is cumbered with laws passed in a moment of moral excitement which remain without influence because they have never represented the true level of public opinion.

Where arguments are so urged for and against sensationalism it may be useful if, out of thirteen years' experience of East London life, I shortly collect what seem to be some of the changes in character which have appeared during this period.

The first change which is manifest is greater humanity in the richer classes. This is shown not only by talk, by drawing-room meetings, and by newspaper articles, but by actual service among the poor. The number of those who go about East London to do good is largely increased. But the increase is, I believe, greatest among those philanthropists who aim to apply principles rather than to provide relief. There have always been people of good-will ready to give and to teach; there is now an increase in their numbers, but the marked increase is among those who, following Mrs. Nassau Senior, work registry offices on the
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of 'imperial' questions so long as 'wages' questions are neglected, and they kill themselves many generous instincts. 'What,' said a speaker at a debate, 'was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.' They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividend. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy 'sweated' clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. 'Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,' is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. 'The nearer, the severer,' is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the governof India they make 'too much of interest and too little passions.' They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
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Kilburn a park or to East London a People's Palace. Hearing that the masses are irreligious, means are supported without regard as to what must be the influence on thoughtless men of associating religion with things which are not true, or honourable, nor lovely, nor of good report.

On all sides among persons of good-will there seems to be the belief that things done for people are more effective than things done with people. There is an absence of the patience—the passionate patience—which is content to examine, to serve, to wait, and even to fail, so long as what is done shall be well done.

The same impatience which takes this shape among the richer classes is, I think, to be seen among the poorer classes in a growing animosity against the rich for being rich. Strong words and angry threats have become common. All suffering and much sin are laid at the doors of the rich, and speakers are approved who say that if by any means property could be more equally shared, more happiness and virtue would follow. Schemes, therefore, which offer such means are welcomed almost without inquiry. Artisans, roused by what they hear of the state in which their poorer neighbours live, misled often by what they see, do not inquire into causes of sin and sorrow. Scamps and idlers come forward with cries which get popular support, and the mass of the poor now cherish such a jealous disposition that, were they suddenly to inherit the place of the richer classes, they would inherit their vices also, and make a state of society in no way better than the present.

There may be such a thing as a noble impatience, but the impatience which has lately been added to character of both rich and poor is not such as to make observers sanguine of the social reform which it may accomplish. The old saying is still true, 'He that believeth shall not make haste.'

The other change in character which has become manifest is one at which I have already hinted. It is a growing disposition among all classes to trust in 'societies,' whose rules become the authority of the workers and whose extension
making trade impossible, they urge, 'We never knew,' how are the Churches to excuse themselves, whose duty it was to unite rich and poor in holy communion?

The Churches have to reveal the poor and the rich to one another. At present they are unknown. The rich think the poor are so made as to enjoy a life of work; they talk as if a wage of twenty shillings a week were quite satisfactory, and condemn the extravagance which 'wastes' a few shillings on a picture, or a few pounds on a funeral. They are astonished that workmen's girls should desire to be taught the piano, or that workmen themselves should aspire to travel; they think the club doctor, paid at the rate of four shillings a year, with the gift of a hospital letter, ought to meet all the needs of ill-health. The rich do not conceive the life lived in the thousands of homes occupied by workmen, and they are not much helped by the sensational stories which have become the padding of advertising charities, and which are true only in a few exceptional cases.

But the poor are quite as ignorant of the lives of the rich, and they are not helped to understand them by the revelations of law courts or the representations on the stage. The poor do not know the simple home-life of the average English employer, the talk about things and books by which the minds of old and young are cheered, the thoughts about others, about neighbours and workmen, about foreign affairs and trade complications which occupy quiet hours, the actions for others' pleasure which every day take up so much time. The breakfast-table of an employer, with its family circle, would probably reveal to the workman a new way of living. A man was once asked how he thought a rich man spent his day. 'In eating and in sleeping,' was the answer, typical of the common opinion. Mr. Charles Booth is doing the work of the Churches by showing the public how the poor live, but he would be the first to confess that his figure-picture is a lifeless picture. It is the Churches which can show the poor man to the rich man, the rich man to the poor man, so that the one will understand the other. When they have met on the equal
platform of the Church's floor and looked into one another's
eyes at the Church's conference or meeting, when they have
met at one another's houses and learnt, by what they see, how
the others live, the employer will not any longer doubt that
the workman has a mind, or the workman doubt that the
employer has a heart.

The Churches by speech, in season and out of season, must
teach the public how people live; they must give facts
and figures, examples and instances. And, as knowledge
comes by contact more than by hearsay, they must bring rich
and poor together to enjoy the same pleasures, to discuss the
same questions, to join in the same pursuits. They must in
a very real sense make them neighbours before they can love
others as they love themselves.

'War comes,' we are told, 'by misunderstanding.' This
is true of the labour-war, and misunderstanding the Churches
might do much to remove. Public opinion, inspired by a high
ideal and instructed in the facts of life, would do most to settle
the labour problems. It is indeed public opinion, and not
force nor law, which largely fixes the rate of wages and the
length of the working-day. English public opinion will not
now allow workpeople to live as the Chinese live, or even to
go barefoot. Public opinion might make it impossible for
English workpeople to live without leisure for reading or
recreation, without resources for health or travel, without
room for decency or cleanliness, as it might make it impossible
for English employers to surround themselves with luxuries,
less in the development of their own characters or in those
of others.

The Churches have done much, but they have not educated
public opinion in this direction. They have rather been
ambitious, sometimes for the triumph of the doctrine they
represent, sometimes for their ministers. They have seemed
to the people to be anxious only to make proselytes, or to get
a reputation of being peacemakers or arbitrators. 'Advertising
parsons and peripatetic philanthropists' are the titles their
ministers have earned. There are Churches whose members are
bound to take a wider view of their work. They are all under the control of the same body which controls the nation, and they thus serve only one master. A public library, for instance, which is worked by the municipality will be more useful than one worked by a society or a company. The book will not be chosen to promulgate the doctrines of a sect so much as to extend knowledge, and its management will not be so arranged as to please any large subscriber so much as to please the people. Instead, therefore, of starting societies it would be wise for social reformers to throw their strength into national organisations.

The Board of Guardians might thus be made efficient in giving relief. From its funds and with the help of organisation a much more perfect scheme of emigration could be worked than by private societies, whose funds are limited and whose inquiries are incomplete. The workhouse might provide such a system of industrial training as would fit its inmates on their discharge both to take and to enjoy labor. It is as much by others' neglect as by their own fault that many strong men and women drift to the relieving office unable to earn a living because they have never been taught to work. The Poor Law infirmary, too, properly organised, under doctors and nurses, and visited by ladies, might be a school of purity and the home of discipline in which the falling might be helped to find strength. The pauper schools, which, by the service of devoted officers, education could be perfected, might do better work than the schools and orphanages which depend on voluntary offerings and often aim at narrow issues. The Guardians, moreover, having the power over out-relief, have in their hands a great instrument good or evil. Rightly used, the power gives to many who would weak a new strength, as they realise that refusal implies respect, and that a system of relief which encourages one to bluster and another to cringe, cannot be good.

The School Board might, in the same way, be made to cover the aims of the educationists. As managers of individual schools these reformers could bring themselves in
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Those connection with teachers and children. They could show the teachers what is implied in knowledge, introduce books of wider views, and they could visit the children's homes, arrange for their holidays, and see to their pleasures. Much more important is it that the schools under the nation's control should be good than that special schools should be started to achieve certain results. In connection, too, with the Board it is possible to have night classes, which should be reality classes in higher education, and means both of promoting friendship and gaining knowledge.

Then there are the municipal bodies, the Vestries and Boards of Works, which largely control the conditions which people of goodwill strive to improve. It rests with these bodies to build habitable houses and to see that those built are habitable, and they are responsible for the lighting and cleaning of the streets. It is in their power to open libraries and reading-rooms, to make for every neighbourhood a common drawing-room, to build baths, so that cleanliness is no longer impossible, and perhaps, even to supply music in open spaces. It is by their will, or rather by their want of will, that the houses exist in which the young are tempted to their ruin, and only needs their energy to work a reform at which purity societies vainly strive.

Lastly, there is the national organisation which is the greatest of all, the Church, the society of societies, the body whose object it is to carry out the aim of all societies, to be the centre of charitable effort, to spread among high and low the knowledge of the Highest, to enforce on all the supremacy of duty over pleasure, and to tell everywhere the Gospel which is joy and peace. If the Church fulfilled its object, there would be no need of societies or of sects. If the Church fails, it is because it is allowed to remain under the control of a clerical body; its charity tends thus to become limited, its ideas of duty are affected by its organisation, and it preaches not what is taught by the Holy Spirit, who is 'The Giver of life' now, as in the past, but it teaches only what its governing body remembers of the past teaching of that Spirit. All
changes which the law-making department of the State has endured may without fear submit the right-making department to like changes.

It is no new principle to reform the Reformed Church. By a law of Henry VIII. the king has authority to "reform, correct all errors, heresies and abuses," and the people's Parliament now takes the place of the king. "The particular form of Divine worship," says the preface to Edward VI.'s second Prayer Book, "and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, &c. &c." The Long Parliament changed the whole Constitution and Ritual of the Church. The Restoration Parliament undid that work. Throughout the seventeenth century the Teaching, the Ritual, and the Organisation were discussed as open questions, and the present system is the result purely of a Parliamentary decision.

Three hundred years ago, to suit the new age, the new birth of learning, the Church was reformed. The present times are marked by changes as great as those of the Renaissance, and the Church remains unchanged. As was the Church of the sixteenth century, so is the Church of the nineteenth century.

The government of England has become popular, and the people elect the Parliament which makes the laws; the Church of England is still exclusive, and the clergy in "their" churches and "their" parishes are still supreme.

Freedom has destroyed monopolies; and, according to a rough scale, justice is equally administered. In the Church, monopolies still exist, justice is defied in arrangements which are for the benefit of the strong, and the clergy are a "protected" class.

The language and the fashion of Englishmen have changed, but the Church still addresses men with the language and the ritual of the Middle Ages.

The Church, long ago reformed to suit new needs, the rites of which are "alterable," has not been made to suit the needs of
modern times. The Church must be again reformed. If details be asked as to the Constitution of the Church of the future, if questions rise to men's lips, 'What will be done about bishops?' 'Who will fix the limits of doctrine?' 'How will the rights of minorities be considered?' the simple answer is that all can be settled by the people. The Reformers of 1882 did not map out the details of the new government of England; they simply gave the power to the people, and the people rooted out abuses and reformed the administration of law. It will be sufficient to-day if the people are admitted to that place in Church government which is now usurped by the clergy or their nominees.

The State is democratic, the Church must also be democratic. As the State is governed by the people for the people, the Church must be governed by the people for the people.

It is waste of time to make a paper constitution, which often binds the hopes of its makers to one plan. Church boards, a popular veto on patronage, or a general synod, may be the best means of introducing the people's power, but it is not wise to proceed as if the means were ends. Church reformers need not advocate any means as essential, the one thing essential is to give the people power to form their own Church; to see, in a word, that the Church is the people's Church.

The obstacle to Church reform is not the doubt as to its possibility or a difference of opinion as to its method. The real obstacle is the general indifference to religion. The zeal or enthusiasm which passes as religious is most often roused by opinions, and, as Wesley said, 'Zeal for opinions is not zeal for religion.' In the noise of controversy and in the hurry of trade the very nature of religion seems forgotten. The arguments of theologians and the sensationalism of revivalists are discussed as religious problems, in which it is well to show an intelligent interest, but men do not feel that their daily lives, the lives of the poor, and the hope of England depend on their relation with God. If it were really seen that
Those whose aim it is to reform the material condition which life is spent may, together with those who teach, to be strengthening character, but the admission of their must depend on the way in which they have worked. themselves can alone tell how far in pursuit of their aims have forgotten the effect of their means upon character, how those means are now represented by people whose g they have helped or hindered. Teachers are not above formers, and reformers are not above teachers. They must be taught, and conditions must be changed. It those who teach, as well as for those who try to change conditions, to judge themselves by the effect their methods on character. If striving and crying they have avoided patience and allowed time for the growth of original working silently they have indeed done something else find faults in other's methods, they may be said to secured the good and avoided the loss.

Samuel A. Barnes
PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM

Some time ago I met in a tramcar a well-known American clergyman. 'Ah!' said he, 'ten years' work in New York a minister at large made me a Christian socialist.' The remark illustrates my own experience.

Ten years ago my wife and I came to live in East London. The study of political economy and some familiarity with the condition of the poor had shown us the harm of doles given the shape either of charity or of out-relief. We found that its so given did not make the poor any richer, but served rather to perpetuate poverty. We came, therefore, to East London determined to war against a system of relief which, so fondly cherished by the poor, meant ruin to their possibilities of living an independent and satisfying life. The work of some devoted men on the Board of Guardians, helped members of the Charity Organisation Society, has enabled us to see the victory won.

In this Whitechapel Union there is no out-relief, and charity is given only to those who, by their forethought their self-sacrifice, awaken the feelings of respect and attitude which find a natural expression in giving and receiving presents. The result has not disappointed our hopes. The poor have learnt to help themselves, and have found self-help a stronger bond by which to keep the home together than the dole of the relieving officer or of the district visitor. The rates have been saved 6,000l. a year, and that sum remains in

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Nineteenth Century of April 1883.
THE CHURCH AND LABOUR DISPUTE

The Medieval Church dreamed of being a universal peacemaker, when the Pope would settle in his court questions between kings or nations. The Churches of to-day are haunted by the same dream. Each little flock hopes to inherit the kingdom, and its ministers aspire to settle questions between labour and capital. Things in dreams are not as they seem, but dreams now, as in old times, have their interpretations, and are sometimes guides to truth. The Churches may, perhaps, help to solve the labour problems, but not by putting up their ministers to hear evidence and to give judgment. Their part is rather to teach than to judge, and to give than to take evidence.

The public is the only potentate who can fill the place which the Pope grasped, and from its opinion there is an appeal. It is for the Churches (1) so to inspire the public that its judgment will be sound, and (2) then to offer the evidence on which it may exercise that judgment.

(1) The chief duty of the Churches to the world is to set forward an ideal of life, to draw out admiration for noble, generous, and honest conduct, and to show the penalties which surely follow all forms of lying and selfishness. This duty has special applications, according as different subjects arise for the judgment of the public.

The labour problems, the rate of wages, the length of the working day, the rights of trades unions, the treatment of the unskilled, the weak and the old, press for settlement.

Reprinted by permission from the Review of the Churches.
to provide for pleasure, for old age, or even for the best medical skill. There can be for him no quiet hours with books or pictures, while his children or friends make music or his solace. He can invite no friends for a Christmas lance; he can wander in the thought of no future of pleasure or of rest. England is the land of sad monuments. The saddest monument is, perhaps, 'the respectable working man,' who has been erected in honour of Thrift. His brains, which might have shown the world how to save men, have been spent in saving pence; his life, which might have been happy and full, has been dulled and saddened by taking 'thought for the morrow.'

This ought not so to be, and this will not always be. The question therefore naturally occurs, 'Why should not the State provide what is needed?' This is the question to which the Socialist is ready with many a response.

Some of his suggestions, even if good, are impracticable. It may be urged, for instance, that relief works should be started, that State workshops should be opened, and starvation made impossible. Or it may be urged that the land should be nationalised and large incomes divided. To such suggestions, and to many like them, it is a sufficient answer that they are impracticable. Their attainment, even were it desirable, is not within measurable distance, and to press them is likely to distract attention from what is possible. If a boy who goes out 'in the interest of the fox' can spoil a hunt by dragging a herring across the scent, a well-meaning socialist may hinder reform by drawing a fair fancy across the line of men's imagination.

All real progress must be by growth; the new must be a development of the old, and not a branch added on from another root. A change which does not fit into and grow out of things that already exist is not a practicable change and such are some of the changes now advocated by socialists upon platforms.

The condition of the people is one not to be long endured, but the answer to the question, 'What can the State do?'
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of ‘imperial’ questions so long as ‘wages’ questions are neglected, and they kill themselves with many generous instincts. ‘What,’ said a speaker at a debate, ‘was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.’ They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy ‘sweat’ clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. ‘Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,’ is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to unjustly exploit those in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. ‘The nearer, the severer,’ is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make ‘too much of interest and too little of passions.’ They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
ight, according to this definition, be a statement of a principle to say that the remedy for the sadness of English labour is to be sought in letting the State provide for a man's needs while he is left to provide for his own wants. It is, however, a statement which, depending on an arbitrary and shifting definition, would not be understood. If, as another statement of a principle, it be said that means of life may be provided, while for means of livelihood a man must work, then it becomes difficult to draw a distinction, for some means of life are also means of livelihood. There is no principle as yet stated according to which limits of State interference may be defined.

The better plan is to consider the laws which are accepted as laws of England, and to study how, by their development, a remedy may be found. On the statute book there are many socialistic laws. The Poor Law, the Education Act, the Established Church, the Land Act, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, and the Libraries Act are socialistic.

The Poor Law provides relief for the destitute and medical care for the poor. By a system of out-door relief it has won the condemnation of many who care for the poor, and see that out-door relief robs them of their energy, their self-respect, and their homes. There is no reason, however, why the Poor Law should not be developed in more healthy ways. Pensions of 8s. or 10s. a week might be given to every citizen who had kept himself until the age of 60 without workhouse aid. If such pensions were the right of all, none would be tempted to lie to get them, nor would any be tempted to spy and bully in order to show the undesert of applicants. So long as relief is a matter of desert, and so long as the most conscientious relieving officers are liable to err, there must be mistakes both on the side of indulgence and of neglect.

The one objection to out-relief, which is at present recognised by the poor, is that the system puts it in the power of the relieving officer to act as judge in matters of which he must be ignorant, so that he gives relief to the careless or crafty, and passes over those who, in self-respect, hide their trouble.
England the strongest of the sects. In a short time one of the parties now held in union within the Establishment would obtain the supremacy, and that party would inherit all the power and prestige of the position. This party—being only a section of the religious body—would pose as the representative of religion, and its clergy would identify their interests with the interest of God. Again, there would be some Becket to oppose the will of Parliament, and to call some law affecting his order 'irreligious,' and a clericalism would be let loose to assume, and perhaps make hateful, the name of religion. 'Clericalism is the enemy of men,' is a saying which has much truth in it. The pity is if clericalism and religion are enabled to seem to be the same thing.

Disestablishment, finally, would intensify the competition of sects. To make one proselyte, the supporters of various forms would compass sea and land. The standard of morality would be lowered, and the flags of doctrine, invented out of will-worship, would be waved to bring in rich adherents, and get the use of their money. Even, as it is, there is no need to go far to find work, which would fall to pieces if the preacher spoke the truth to the subscribers about their private life or their tempers. It is urged that the congregations in American non-established Churches are large; it is not urged that the people in America are above bribery in politics or above cheating in trade. It is not urged that American social life is spiritualised, and that is the only fact which would be evidence of the good of the system.

To sum up the case against those who offer Disestablishment of the Church as an answer to the question, 'How is the nation to be brought into union with the spirit of goodness?' it may be urged that—

1. Disestablishment is a destructive and wasteful method of getting rid of abuses, and would destroy the power of the State to teach what the State holds to be truth.

2. Disestablishment would establish clericalism, a force which more than once in history has made religion hateful, and roused for its repression the God-fearing men of the nation.
3. Disestablishment, trusting to competition, would leave poor neighbourhoods unhelped. A poor congregation could not hope for a church in which worship should be stirred by the beauty of sight and sound. An ignorant population would not exert itself to get either a church or a teacher. The most needy would thus be the most neglected. It is only the State which can give with equal hand to all its members, and which thus can either educate or spiritualise the masses.

The solution offered by those who say, 'Reform the Church,' remains for examination.

These, like the religious liberationists, are anxious that the instrument for spiritualising life should be effective. But the Reformers recognise that this, the highest object of any organisation, is also the object of the State, and can only be attained by means of the Constitution. Individuals may be left to provide for the wants they have recognised. But the State must provide for the wants of the higher life and send out teachers to tell individuals of things beyond their ken. The Church reformers urge, therefore, that the principle of Establishment should be retained, but that abuses should be eradicated and old-fashioned methods reformed.

The practical difficulties of reform are doubtless many, but they are not insuperable. Inasmuch as Burke has said, 'What is taught by a State Church must be decided by the State, and not by the clergy;' it is possible to conceive that the nation, and not a sect, might determine how truth should be sought and taught. Inasmuch as now it is the people who directly or indirectly appoint their rulers, it is easy to conceive how the people, and not a patron, might have a voice in the choice of the parson, and how the parishioners, and not the parson, might govern the Church and the parish. There need be no ill-paid, no over-paid, no unworthy incumbent. There need be no neglected parish, and a State Church might be as effective an organisation for promoting spirituality as the State Post-office is for promoting intercourse.

Institutions have survived a greater reform than that which is required in the Church, and those who have seen the
arouse the deadened to life. The best things gain nothing by being made private property; a fine picture possessed by the State will give the individual who looks at it as much pleasure as if he possessed it. It is no idle dream that the Crystal Palace might become a national institution, open for the enjoyment of all, dedicated to the service of the people for the recreation of their lives, by means of music, knowledge, and beauty.

If still it be said that none of these good things touch the want most recognised, the need of better dwellings, then have in the Artisans' Dwellings Act a law which only requires wise handling to be made to serve this purpose. A Land Board has now the power to pull down rookeries and erect decent dwellings at low rents. Unwisely handled, the law may only destroy existing dwellings, and put heavy compensation into the pockets of unworthy landlords and into those of active officials; wisely handled, the same law may at no very great expense replace the houses which ruin the life of the poor and disgrace the English name.

Thus it is—and other laws, such as the Irish Land Act—are open to the same process of development—that without revolution reform could be wrought.

I can conceive a great change in the condition of the people worked out in our own generation, without any revolutionary break with the past. With wages at their present rate I can imagine the houses made strong and healthy, education and public baths made free, and the possibility of investing in land made easy. I can imagine that, without increase of their private wealth, the poor might have in libraries, music-halls, and flower gardens that on which wealth is spent. I can imagine the youth of the nation made strong by means of fresh air and the doctor's care, the aged made restful by means of honourable pensions. I can imagine the Church as the people's Church, its buildings the halls where they are taught by their choicest teachers, the meeting-places where they learn the secret of unit and brotherly love, the houses of prayer where, in the presence of the Best, they lift themselves into the higher life of duty and
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I cannot imagine that which must be reached by new
partures and so-called Continental practices. Any scheme,
however it may promise in the future, which involves revolu-
tion in the present is impracticable, and any flirting with it
likely to hinder the progress of reform.

But now there rises the obvious objection, ‘All this will
not much money;’ ‘Free education means 1d. in the pound;
braries and museums mean 2d.;’ ‘The suggested changes
would absorb more than 1s.; the ratepayers could not stand it.’

I agree; the present ratepayers could not pay heavier
rates. There must be other means of raising the money.

Some scheme for further graduated taxing is possible; while
the wealth locked up in the endowed charities, the increase
which would be brought to the revenue by a new assessment
of the land-tax, and the sum which might be saved by abolishing
sinecures and waste in every public office would meet a
great part of this need.

The wealth of the endowed charities has never been
realised, and if that amount be not reduced in paying for
elementary education, it might do much to make life happier.
If men saw to what uses this money could be put, they would
not be so ready to back up an agitation raised on the School
Board to get hold of this money for School Board work. They
would say, ‘No; the schools are safe; in some way they must
be provided and paid for. We won’t shield the Board from
attacks of ratepayers by giving them our money to spend; we
want that for things which the Board cannot provide.’

There is also a vast sum which might be got by a new assess-
ment—which in some cases would be a re-imposition—of the
land-tax, and by a closer scrutiny into the ways of public offices.
The land-tax returns the same amount as it returned more
than two hundred years ago, while rents have gone on in-
creasing. The abuses of sinecures and of useless officials are
patent to all who know anything of public work in small areas;
and it is possible that what is done in the vestry, on a small
scale, is developed by the atmosphere of grander surroundings
it is on religion, that is, on keeping up the communication between the little good within and the great good without, between man's broken light and God's full light, that trade, happiness, and life depend; if it were seen that England cannot be virtuous till Englishmen drink of the Fountain of virtue, then Church reform would be undertaken without delay. No difficulty would seem too great to prevent the vast resources of the Church being brought to the service of religion, and the highest intelligence of statesmen would be devoted to making perfect the organisation for spiritualising life.

It may not be in the power of those of less intelligence to tell the method of reform, but all who are weary at the thought of the present condition of the people may refresh themselves with hopes. Those who reflect on the cheerless faces so common to East London, the dull, weary round of the workers, their dreadful life and their hopeless death, are borne down by the thought that each one of these lives in the parish of some Church minister. They weary themselves wondering how the servant provided by the State might better serve the needs of the poor, how the great Church organisation might eradicate unfit houses, bring wealth to the relief of poverty, and make the means of joy more equal. They ask themselves in vain how the house of God might be a house for God's children. Unable to answer, they may at any rate gladden themselves with an ideal.

The People's Church then may be so close to the best thought of the nation that it will reflect that thought in every parish, as the ministers who have gathered light from the greatest teachers of science and history direct that light on to the lives of the hardest workers. It may be so near to every individual that its buildings will be the meeting place of all, the scene of the Holy Communion, where men will learn to know and love God and man. It may so bring together rich and poor, the cultured and the ignorant, that the efforts and the money now fitfully wasted by rival philanthropists will be directed to the effectual remedy of ignorance and poverty. The ministers of the People's Church may be near to God and
near to men, a means by which the avenues to the highest are kept open, the spiritual teachers who, by their lives and doctrines, touch the divine within the human, and make all men respond to the call of right and duty, and settle life on eternal calm.

The conception of such a Church is possible, though it is not possible to say how it may be accomplished; or how these competing claims of creeds and rituals to be religion may be satisfied; or how the rights of men and the rights of their little systems may be sunk in the thought of duty. The organisation of the Church of the future is not now to be sketched. The first step which it is for this generation to take has been made clear. All progress has been through the people, and the Church must be in fact, as in name, the people's Church. There must be a parish parliament and not a parish despot, and the government of the Church must be by the people as well as for the people.

This is the first step, and what will follow is in God's counsels. It is the people who govern the nation and decide on peace or war. They have moulded the machinery by which justice is administered and freedom secured; the people must also mould the machinery by which right will be taught and life spiritualised. If they are excluded from exercising their will upon the Establishment, nothing can hinder them from destroying it. God speaks in every age; He has not forgotten to be gracious, and the people are now His instruments, as in old days were kings. It is by them His will is being done, and in that belief the people may be trusted so to order the Church that by its means the Holy Spirit will once more show among men the fruit of virtue and honesty.

Samuel A. Barnett.
Sunday afternoon’s excitement—of matters which should be in their hearts, killing time which might have been fruitful of thought and joy and love. ‘The future belongs to those who refuse to take himself seriously,’ says the mock philosopher. The ignorance which accepts the teaching, which goes with a light heart to agitate or to repress agitation, is a sight to destroy anyone’s ease of mind.

You have met Sin, the degradation which comes from selfishness. In West London it often hides under its trappings. Culture covers a multitude of sins. In the quisitely ordered banquet intemperance and self-indulgence are unnoticed; in the phraseology of the office greed and selfishness pass as political economy; and in the polished exterior of books and of society impurity loses its true colour. You, though, are familiar with East London, and here you see Sin without its trappings; you know that intemperance—eating and over-drinking—means a brutalised nature; you know that greed is cruelty, and that impurity is destruction both of reason and of feeling. You have seen the victims of Sin, the drunkard’s home, the gambler’s hell, and the sweatshop. You know that the wages of sin is death, and that culture can give to Mammon any nobility or warm his heart with any spark of unselfish joy.

Poverty, Ignorance, Sin—these threaten the city. Your common longing is to avert its doom. Our fathers nourished a like longing. They hoped in Free Trade, the Suffrage, National Education, and they have been disappointed.

Free Trade has, indeed, greatly increased wealth; the number of the comfortable has been multiplied, but it is questionable whether, in the same proportion, the number of the uncomfortable has not also been multiplied. Our England is larger than the England of fifty years ago, but a larger population—like a giraffe’s throat—may only provide a larger space of pain! At any rate, Free Trade, which has given us cheap bread, has not solved the problem of the unemployed.

The extension of the Suffrage, again, for which our fathers strove, has had good results; but the example of l
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parliaments and the growing tendency to legislate by demonstration hardly justified their hopes. Our fathers held that the possession of the suffrage would be effective to destroy ignorance; they thought that responsibility would develop the seriousness which is necessary to knowledge. They—like her good men who need God's forgiveness—fed Ignorance with abuse of opponents, with exaggerations, with party cries, they tried to bribe Ignorance to establish its own executioner; but now Ignorance is too much puffed up by flattery, too much enriched by bribes, to yield to the voice which from the register and polling booth says, 'England expects every man vote according to his conscience, and then to submit to the common will.'

Lastly, the passing of the Education Act seemed to many be the beginning of a new age. Schools were rapidly built, money was freely voted, and the children were compelled to attend. The Education Act has not, however, taught the people what is due to themselves or to others. Greed is not eradicated because its form is changed, and, though criminals may be fewer, gambling is as degrading as thieving, and oppression legally exerted over the weak is as cruel as the illegal low. The children do not leave school with the self-respect born of consciousness of powers of heart and brain and hand, or with the humanity born of knowledge of others' burdens. It seems, indeed, as if their chief belief was in the value of competition, and their chief aptitude a skill in satisfying an inspector with the least possible amount of work. At any rate, at the end of twenty years, when a generation has been through the schools, our streets are filled with a mob of careless youths, and our labour market is overstocked with workers whose work is not worth 4d. an hour.

Poverty, Ignorance, and Sin threaten the city. Free Trade, the Suffrage, the Education Act have been tried, and the doom still impends. What is to be done? The principle of true action lies, I think, imbedded in the old Jewish tale. It is not laws and institutions which save a city—it is persons. Institutions are good, just in so far as they are vivified by per-
veloping honesty offer themselves for examination. It is worthy of remark that the common arguments for Disestablishment, except those urged by the opponents of all religion, hardly touch the principle of Establishment.

Secularists urge that religion being useless and spirituality a fancy, it is no business of the State to do anything to spiritualise the life of its members as a means to increase virtue. Their position is unassailable, and the day on which the nation decides that God has no relation to life, the Church as a spiritualising agency must be disestablished, its buildings turned into lecture halls, and its endowments devoted to the reduction of the national debt or to the teaching of art and science.

The position of the Secularists is occupied by few. The ordinary advocate of Disestablishment is anxious that the life of the nation may be spiritualised, but he sees that the Church is ineffective, he marks its abuses, its rivalry with the sects, and its assumption of superiority. He argues that its ineffectiveness and its assumption are due to its connection with the State, and urges that Disestablishment alone will sweep out the abuses. He condemns abuses but he cannot condemn a principle which affirms the duty of the State to teach the higher life, because he himself has probably approved the principle as a supporter of Education Acts, liquor laws, and other legislation of a like aim.

It is allowed by the majority of the people that the State should teach the life of prudence, and schools are established under local School Boards to teach every child, so that he may earn his living. Further, it is allowed that the State should control the forces which, for good or evil, may rouse the people, and thus licensing boards are established to limit the sale of strong drink.

The same principle is involved in an Established Church. If the State educates the citizens, and admits its responsibility for the formation of their characters, a line can hardly be drawn at a point which would exclude it from giving the people the means which are the best security for happiness and for morality.
The principle of Establishment does not—as its opponents often think—assert that a sect has truth; it asserts that the nation has truth, or is seeking it. The truth abides in the best thought of the whole nation, and the Church is established to express that truth. The clergy have no special rights, they are servants appointed to do the will of the nation. Truth abides not in 'the Church' of the bishops and clergy nor in a book, it abides in the people. Once when it was proposed in the House of Commons to refer a matter of doctrine to the bishops, 'No, by the faith I bear to God,' said Mr. Wentworth, with the approval of the House, 'we will pass nothing before we understand what it is, for that were to make you Popes.' It is the people, therefore, which by its Parliament has settled, and may again settle, the limits of teaching and ritual.

The nation, in old language, is holy. The body of people called English is set apart for a special service, its laws are laws of God, its work is worship, and every one of its members owes a duty to God. The memory of such a fact was kept alive in Israel where every town's meeting was a congregation, every parliament a solemn assembly, every law the Word of God, and every workman was inspired by the Spirit of God. The Jewish nation has been preserved in the Jewish Church. The fact that the English nation is holy must also be kept alive. The nation, that is, must be a Church and its citizens organised for worship. 'The spirit of nationality,' says Burke, 'is at once the bond and the safeguard of nations; it is something above laws and beyond thrones, the impalpable element, the inner life of states.' In his own language Burke asserts the holiness of nations, and it is with a view to protect this impalpable element that it becomes so important for nations to identify their secular and religious aspects, to be at once nations and churches with duties to men and to God.

Disestablishment denies this holiness, and so lets escape the strongest element in nationality. Disestablishment is, moreover, a short-sighted policy, because, however great be the measure of Disendowment, it would make the Church of
England the strongest of the sects. In a short time one of the parties now held in union within the Establishment would obtain the supremacy, and that party would inherit all the power and prestige of the position. This party—being only a section of the religious body—would pose as the representative of religion, and its clergy would identify their interests with the interest of God. Again, there would be some Becket to oppose the will of Parliament, and to call some law affecting his order 'irreligious,' and a clericalism would be let loose to assume, and perhaps make hateful, the name of religion. "Clericalism is the enemy of men," is a saying which has much truth in it. The pity is if clericalism and religion are enabled to seem to be the same thing.

Disestablishment, finally, would intensify the competition of sects. To make one proselyte, the supporters of various forms would compass sea and land. The standard of morality would be lowered, and the flags of doctrine, invented out of will-worship, would be waved to bring in rich adherents, and get the use of their money. Even, as it is, there is no need to go far to find work, which would fall to pieces if the preacher spoke the truth to the subscribers about their private life or their tempers. It is urged that the congregations in American non-established Churches are large; it is not urged that the people in America are above bribery in politics or above cheating in trade. It is not urged that American social life is spiritualised, and that is the only fact which would be evidence of the good of the system.

To sum up the case against those who offer Disestablishment of the Church as an answer to the question, 'How is the nation to be brought into union with the spirit of goodness?' it may be urged that—

1. Disestablishment is a destructive and wasteful method of getting rid of abuses, and would destroy the power of the State to teach what the State holds to be truth.

2. Disestablishment would establish clericalism, a force which more than once in history has made religion hateful, and roused for its repression the God-fearing men of the nation.
3. Disestablishment, trusting to competition, would leave poor neighbourhoods unhelped. A poor congregation could not hope for a church in which worship should be stirred by the beauty of sight and sound. An ignorant population would not exert itself to get either a church or a teacher. The most needy would thus be the most neglected. It is only the State which can give with equal hand to all its members, and which thus can either educate or spiritualise the masses.

The solution offered by those who say, 'Reform the Church,' remains for examination.

These, like the religious liberationists, are anxious that the instrument for spiritualising life should be effective. But the Reformers recognise that this, the highest object of any organisation, is also the object of the State, and can only be attained by means of the Constitution. Individuals may be left to provide for the wants they have recognised. But the State must provide for the wants of the higher life and send out teachers to tell individuals of things beyond their ken. The Church reformers urge, therefore, that the principle of Establishment should be retained, but that abuses should be eradicated and old-fashioned methods reformed.

The practical difficulties of reform are doubtless many, but they are not insuperable. Inasmuch as Burke has said, 'What is taught by a State Church must be decided by the State, and not by the clergy,' it is possible to conceive that the nation, and not a sect, might determine how truth should be sought and taught. Inasmuch as now it is the people who directly or indirectly appoint their rulers, it is easy to conceive how the people, and not a patron, might have a voice in the choice of the parson, and how the parishioners, and not the patron, might govern the Church and the parish. There need be no ill-paid, no over-paid, no unworthy incumbent. There need be no neglected parish, and a State Church might be as effective an organisation for promoting spirituality as the State Post-office is for promoting intercourse.

Institutions have survived a greater reform than that which is required in the Church, and those who have seen the
POOR LAW REFORM

The demand for Poor Law Reform is becoming general. Idealists who have drawn pictures of a society where none hungry in body and none dwarfed in mind have touched national conscience. It seems unendurable that a far should live and sleep and work in one room, that a mother her children should be expected to exist on 4s. 6d. a week that a man should die in the streets of starvation on Christ morning. Mansion House Funds, General Booth’s schemes innumerable charities which have promised everything, have failed or are failing to make much change. Thousands pounds are spent, shelters are open, but still the condition the poor is felt as a reproach by the awakened national conscience. Men’s minds therefore now turn to the Poor Law and its reform is demanded, so that it may if possible reverse the reproach.

Many schemes for reform are suggested, but idealists are good to begin a movement are not always good at pract measures. The men who created the desire for a United I would hardly have made Italy, and the men who have root society to consider the state of its poor as a reproach are likely to be those best able to remove the reproach. Ideal see heaven plainly, but are apt to miss earth’s facts. They are so set on the possible that they do not recognise actual.

Some reformers, for example, see the beauty and strength

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Contemporary Review of March 1
modern times. The Church must be again reformed. If
details be asked as to the Constitution of the Church of the
future, if questions rise to men's lips, 'What will be done about
bishops?' 'Who will fix the limits of doctrine?' 'How
will the rights of minorities be considered?' the simple answer
is that all can be settled by the people. The Reformers of
1832 did not map out the details of the new government of
England; they simply gave the power to the people, and the
people rooted out abuses and reformed the administration of
law. It will be sufficient to-day if the people are admitted to
that place in Church government which is now usurped by the
clergy or their nominees.

The State is democratic, the Church must also be democ-
ragric. As the State is governed by the people for the
people, the Church must be governed by the people for the
people.

It is waste of time to make a paper constitution, which
often binds the hopes of its makers to one plan. Church
boards, a popular veto on patronage, or a general synod, may
be the best means of introducing the people's power, but it is
not wise to proceed as if the means were ends. Church re-
formers need not advocate any means as essential, the one
thing essential is to give the people power to form their own
Church; to see, in a word, that the Church is the people's
Church.

The obstacle to Church reform is not the doubt as to its
possibility or a difference of opinion as to its method. The
real obstacle is the general indifference to religion. The zeal
or enthusiasm which passes as religious is most often roused
by opinions, and, as Wesley said, 'Zeal for opinions is not
zeal for religion.' In the noise of controversy and in the
hurry of trade the very nature of religion seems forgotten.
The arguments of theologians and the sensationalism of
revivalists are discussed as religious problems, in which it is
well to show an intelligent interest, but men do not feel that
their daily lives, the lives of the poor, and the hope of England
depend on their relation with God. If it were really seen that
it is on religion, that is, on keeping up the communication between the little good within and the great good without, between man's broken light and God's full light, that trade, happiness, and life depend; if it were seen that England cannot be virtuous till Englishmen drink of the Fountain of virtue, then Church reform would be undertaken without delay. No difficulty would seem too great to prevent the vast resources of the Church being brought to the service of religion, and the highest intelligence of statesmen would be devoted to making perfect the organisation for spiritualising life.

It may not be in the power of those of less intelligence to tell the method of reform, but all who are weary at the thought of the present condition of the people may refresh themselves with hopes. Those who reflect on the cheerless faces so common to East London, the dull, weary round of the workers, their dreadful life and their hopeless death, are borne down by the thought that each one of these lives in the parish of some Church minister. They weary themselves wondering how the servant provided by the State might better serve the needs of the poor, how the great Church organisation might eradicate unfit houses, bring wealth to the relief of poverty, and make the means of joy more equal. They ask themselves in vain how the house of God might be a house for God's children. Unable to answer, they may at any rate gladden themselves with an ideal.

The People's Church then may be so close to the best thought of the nation that it will reflect that thought in every parish, as the ministers who have gathered light from the greatest teachers of science and history direct that light on to the lives of the hardest workers. It may be so near to every individual that its buildings will be the meeting place of all, the scene of the Holy Communion, where men will learn to know and love God and man. It may so bring together rich and poor, the cultured and the ignorant, that the efforts and the money now fitfully wasted by rival philanthropists will be directed to the effectual remedy of ignorance and poverty. The ministers of the People's Church may be near to God and
near to men, a means by which the avenues to the highest are kept open, the spiritual teachers who, by their lives and doctrines, touch the divine within the human, and make all men respond to the call of right and duty, and settle life on eternal calm.

The conception of such a Church is possible, though it is not possible to say how it may be accomplished; or how these competing claims of creeds and rituals to be religion may be satisfied; or how the rights of men and the rights of their little systems may be sunk in the thought of duty. The organisation of the Church of the future is not now to be sketched. The first step which it is for this generation to take has been made clear. All progress has been through the people, and the Church must be in fact, as in name, the people’s Church. There must be a parish parliament and not a parish despot, and the government of the Church must be by the people as well as for the people.

This is the first step, and what will follow is in God’s counsels. It is the people who govern the nation and decide on peace or war. They have moulded the machinery by which justice is administered and freedom secured; the people must also mould the machinery by which right will be taught and life spiritualised. If they are excluded from exercising their will upon the Establishment, nothing can hinder them from destroying it. God speaks in every age; He has not forgotten to be gracious, and the people are now His instruments, as in old days were kings. It is by them His will is being done, and in that belief the people may be trusted so to order the Church that by its means the Holy Spirit will once more show among men the fruit of virtue and honesty.

Samuel A. Barnett.
then be met with the distinct offer: 'Will you submit to training for six or twelve months, during which time you shall be kept together and you yourself fitted to earn a livelihood in a shop or on the land?' They who accept the offer will once be put to work. Some will be sent to the farm colony to be taught to dig and do rough field labour, to take new streams into their bodies, and be fitted for agricultural employment at home or abroad; others will be put to tailoring, to work iron work in the workhouse, and be sent out at the end of time with the self-reliance which comes to those who have trade in their hands. They who refuse the offer, as well as they who abuse the offer, will be sent to the house of correction, there to be kept at hard labour for such time as seems good.

By this plan, the unfortunate would be automatified out from the idle, and have within their reach an industry which they might honourably regain a place in the midst of workers. The means are such as long experience proves most likely to be efficient. The unfortunate—by which is meant the poor who are poor by other than their own fault—are either weak or ignorant: weak by inherited tendency by unhealthy living; ignorant by absence of training in the use of application to an industry. Among the thousands of bodied who apply for relief, it is rare to find any skilled mechanic, or indeed anyone who has a trade in his hands, seems as if the possession of a trade lifted its own society another society for which relief systems and workhouse is unnecessary. The community, with its free education and its technical schools, has attempted to put a trade within reach of all, but somehow it fails, and either because schools aim to fill and not to train the mind, or because society and parents are greedy of child-labour, the towns are with men and women fit only 'to turn a wheel.'

There is nothing, therefore, which the community can rightly or wisely do than give to these neglected members an opportunity of learning. In one sense, the gift is paying a debt, a part of the education originally offered; in an
anse, it is an insurance against a greater claim, a means of relief to prevent the ultimate poverty of the whole family.

Other means of relief are vain; money given during slack times, or assistance to increase wages, are remedies worse than the disease. The only way to deal with poverty is to put into the poor man's hands the weapons proved to be effective against poverty. Those weapons are health and skill. Let then the Poor Law put these within the reach of everyone whose good intention is proved by his willingness to submit to training.

It is not the least merit of the proposed plan that it will bring home to the idlers helpful punishment. At present there is little doubt but that the mass of those ragged, wretched human beings who throng relief offices and hang about street corners, is made up of drunkards and idlers. There is little doubt also, but that these unhappy people are supported by the sentiment which provides breakfasts, shelters, and casual doles. The sentiment under the circumstances need not be condemned.

The thought that the beggar shivering in his rags may perchance be worthy and unfortunate, and that for him there is no place of refuge other than the hope-killing workhouse or casual ward, is not to be endured by a brother man, so the shelter is opened and the dole is given. Vain is it for the police and the missionaries to warn the public that such giving encourages a wretched life and makes rags a means of livelihood; common humanity will not be content without an assurance of hope for the lowest of its kind. If, therefore, it were known that the offer of training in honest work were open to everyone willing to submit to kindly discipline, there would be no longer the same disposition to give the dole, and one means to which idlers trust would be removed.

At last the educator and the idler would be face to face, at last the law and the law-breaker would meet together. Too long the idlers, the lazy who refuse to be punctual or regular, the dissolute who riot in the low lodging-houses, the blacklegs who sneak into other men's work, have preyed on society. They have reaped what has been sown for others,
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of 'imperial' questions so long as 'wages' questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. 'What,' said a speaker at a debate, 'was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.' They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy 'sweated' clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. 'Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,' is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. 'The nearer, the severer,' is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make 'too much of interest and too little of passions.' They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
In the first place, there will be in the workhouses and
houses of correction a call for that personal service which,
discovering by friendship the strength and weakness of
character, will supply what is lacking.

Men and women will be able by books, by visits, and by
talk, to give assurance to all who are for the moment isolated
that they are still members of the great human society, and
they will be able to give that individual education without
which the best systems must fail.

There will also be a call for money to start those who
have been trained either at home or abroad, some of whom
will be fit to be put on the land, some to be equipped with tools.
The money now spent on shelter, food, and casual doles, rises
to a mighty sum; but even this sum would be absorbed if
those who had proved themselves worthy received adequate
help. The present system, or want of system, has lowered
the standard of what seems necessary to life.

In the effort to relieve all, the charitable have been content
to provide food insufficient to support the body and accommo-
dation destructive of self-respect. How else could a well-fed
man offer his starving brother a halfpenny dinner to satisfy
his craving, or a dirty leather bed in a crowded room for his
night's rest. A system which would leave to the care of the
charitable only a limited number of families might, it may be
hoped, evoke a charity which would show consideration for
human needs, and generously give what is necessary for
decency and health.

THE AGED POOR

What now, it may be asked, has the Poor Law attempted
to do for the old? The answer is given in the figures set out
by Mr. Charles Booth. It has provided relief for 30 per cent.,
or for a number nearly approaching that figure, of all persons
over sixty-five in England and Wales. Rather, it should be
said, that it has attempted to provide such relief.

The 87,603 who receive the relief in-doors are not happy,
and they have not deserved punishment. The majority are
women. They have probably spent themselves at dull ill-paid work, they have borne children and learnt fully lesson of sorrow; they would have enjoyed in their old to have their children about their knees, to have wand quietly in the haunts of their youth, and lived again it talk of the young. The old in the workhouses, wear the monotonous cleanliness, provoked to selfishness by atmosphere of officialism, made pettish and petty by another's complaints, afford a sad sight. England indeed be rich in teachers if she can thus waste those v God sends to teach reverence and gentleness.

The 420,057 who receive out-relief are not in the sense relieved. They have had to go hat in hand to relieving officer. They have had to submit to his ques and at last have received what must be grudgingly. They live, indeed, amid old haunts and with young fri but they live as paupers, conscious of a barrier between selve and their independent neighbours. They may show signs of the wound their nature bears, but an exper I had in Winnipeg showed me how deeply human nature severance from its kind.

A Whitechapel woman was there living with her hus in a house not better than a Whitechapel house. Their cumstances were poor enough, and the trade of tinke not seem to be well paid. But 'tell them at home,' said, 'that not for 100l. would the old tinker return; our children go to school with the best, and we get respe

The recipients of out-relief are paupers; they form a apart; they are counted up with drunkards and idler they can never feel that they have that respect which the figured life in Winnipeg. They who might have b sweeteness and content into the home bring too often grumb and are the parents of the pauper spirit.

The Poor Law therefore which gives relief to such a proportion of the old people of this country does not thoroughly what it attempts to do. It has removed stimulus to effort; it has lowered the rate of wages; it
taken old age under its care, and it has made old age anxious and sad.

The proposals for reform are general. 'Let there be,' say some, 'carefully discriminated out-relief and classified infirmaries, so that they who are most deserving may have all that they can desire.' But who is to be the judge of character; who is to say that A. shall have out-relief and B. go into the infirmary, that C. is to be treated as if he were an honoured guest, and D. as if he were a criminal? It may be that B. has fought temptations, and had trials which have never come near to A., and that D. has done kindnesses and helped others, as C. never dreamed of doing.

There is no way in which strangers can judge character; the good and the evil must be let grow together; and he who attempts to separate them will destroy the good with the evil.

Beyond this there is something humiliating, a loss of self-respect, which is entailed in submitting to such judgment. The secrets and sorrows of a man’s life are his own; his efforts to save, his charities to children or to friends, his afflictions, the sins of his youth, are not for public use, and he who is called on to expose them suffers irreparably in character. There is a necessary modesty for the character as there is for the person.

It is not, therefore, by lavish out-relief or by infirmaries, although they be pleasant as almshouses, that the needs of old age are to be met.

The more popular proposals are that pensions be provided, and three schemes have been suggested.

There is (1) that by which young people are to be compelled to save and employers compelled to contribute. This may at once be put aside as impracticable. There are classes —wayward youths, factory girls, farm labourers—whom it would be impossible to compel, and there are many workmen and workwomen, costermongers and charwomen, who have no employers. The scheme would moreover entail an army of officials and a system of registration most distasteful to public sentiment.
changes which the law-making department of the State has endured may without fear submit the right-making department to like changes.

It is no new principle to reform the Reformed Church. By a law of Henry VIII. the king has authority to 'reform, correct all errors, heresies and abuses,' and the people's Parliament now takes the place of the king. 'The particular form of Divine worship,' says the preface to Edward VI.'s second Prayer Book, 'and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, &c. &c.' The Long Parliament changed the whole Constitution and Ritual of the Church. The Restoration Parliament undid that work. Throughout the seventeenth century the Teaching, the Ritual, and the Organisation were discussed as open questions, and the present system is the result purely of a Parliamentary decision.

Three hundred years ago, to suit the new age, the new birth of learning, the Church was reformed. The present times are marked by changes as great as those of the Renaissance, and the Church remains unchanged. As was the Church of the sixteenth century, so is the Church of the nineteenth century.

The government of England has become popular, and the people elect the Parliament which makes the laws; the Church of England is still exclusive, and the clergy in 'their' churches and 'their' parishes are still supreme.

Freedom has destroyed monopolies; and, according to a rough scale, justice is equally administered. In the Church, monopolies still exist, justice is defied in arrangements which are for the benefit of the strong, and the clergy are a 'protected' class.

The language and the fashion of Englishmen have changed, but the Church still addresses men with the language and the ritual of the Middle Ages.

The Church, long ago reformed to suit new needs, the rites of which are 'alterable,' has not been made to suit the needs of
modern times. The Church must be again reformed. If
details be asked as to the Constitution of the Church of the
future, if questions rise to men's lips, 'What will be done about
bishops?' 'Who will fix the limits of doctrine?' 'How
will the rights of minorities be considered?' the simple answer
is that all can be settled by the people. The Reformers of
1832 did not map out the details of the new government of
England; they simply gave the power to the people, and the
people rooted out abuses and reformed the administration of
law. It will be sufficient to-day if the people are admitted to
that place in Church government which is now usurped by the
clergy or their nominees.

The State is democratic, the Church must also be demo-
cratic. As the State is governed by the people for the
people, the Church must be governed by the people for the
people.

It is waste of time to make a paper constitution, which
often binds the hopes of its makers to one plan. Church
boards, a popular veto on patronage, or a general synod, may
be the best means of introducing the people's power, but it is
not wise to proceed as if the means were ends. Church re-
formers need not advocate any means as essential, the one
thing essential is to give the people power to form their own
Church; to see, in a word, that the Church is the people's
Church.

The obstacle to Church reform is not the doubt as to its
possibility or a difference of opinion as to its method. The
real obstacle is the general indifference to religion. The zeal
or enthusiasm which passes as religious is most often roused
by opinions, and, as Wesley said, 'Zeal for opinions is not
zeal for religion.' In the noise of controversy and in the
hurry of trade the very nature of religion seems forgotten.
The arguments of theologians and the sensationalism of
revivalists are discussed as religious problems, in which it is
well to show an intelligent interest, but men do not feel that
their daily lives, the lives of the poor, and the hope of England
depend on their relation with God. If it were really seen that
it is on religion, that is, on keeping up the communication between the little good within and the great good without, between man's broken light and God's full light, that trade, happiness, and life depend; if it were seen that England cannot be virtuous till Englishmen drink of the Fountain of virtue, then Church reform would be undertaken without delay. No difficulty would seem too great to prevent the vast resources of the Church being brought to the service of religion, and the highest intelligence of statesmen would be devoted to making perfect the organisation for spiritualising life.

It may not be in the power of those of less intelligence to tell the method of reform, but all who are weary at the thought of the present condition of the people may refresh themselves with hopes. Those who reflect on the cheerless faces so common to East London, the dull, weary round of the workers, their dreadful life and their hopeless death, are borne down by the thought that each one of these lives in the parish of some Church minister. They weary themselves wondering how the servant provided by the State might better serve the needs of the poor, how the great Church organisation might eradicate unfit houses, bring wealth to the relief of poverty, and make the means of joy more equal. They ask themselves in vain how the house of God might be a house for God's children. Unable to answer, they may at any rate gladden themselves with an ideal.

The People's Church then may be so close to the best thought of the nation that it will reflect that thought in every parish, as the ministers who have gathered light from the greatest teachers of science and history direct that light on to the lives of the hardest workers. It may be so near to every individual that its buildings will be the meeting place of all, the scene of the Holy Communion, where men will learn to know and love God and man. It may so bring together rich and poor, the cultured and the ignorant, that the efforts and the money now fitfully wasted by rival philanthropists will be directed to the effectual remedy of ignorance and poverty. The ministers of the People's Church may be near to God and
near to men, a means by which the avenues to the highest are kept open, the spiritual teachers who, by their lives and doctrines, touch the divine within the human, and make all men respond to the call of right and duty, and settle life on eternal calm.

The conception of such a Church is possible, though it is not possible to say how it may be accomplished; or how these competing claims of creeds and rituals to be religion may be satisfied; or how the rights of men and the rights of their little systems may be sunk in the thought of duty. The organisation of the Church of the future is not now to be sketched. The first step which it is for this generation to take has been made clear. All progress has been through the people, and the Church must be in fact, as in name, the people's Church. There must be a parish parliament and not a parish despot, and the government of the Church must be by the people as well as for the people.

This is the first step, and what will follow is in God's counsels. It is the people who govern the nation and decide on peace or war. They have moulded the machinery by which justice is administered and freedom secured; the people must also mould the machinery by which right will be taught and life spiritualised. If they are excluded from exercising their will upon the Establishment, nothing can hinder them from destroying it. God speaks in every age; He has not forgotten to be gracious, and the people are now His instruments, as in old days were kings. It is by them His will is being done, and in that belief the people may be trusted so to order the Church that by its means the Holy Spirit will once more show among men the fruit of virtue and honesty.

Samuel A. Barnett.
THE CHURCH AND LABOUR DISPUTE

The Medieval Church dreamed of being a universal peacemaker, when the Pope would settle in his court questions between kings or nations. The Churches of to-day are haunted by the same dream. Each little flock hopes to inherit the kingdom, and its ministers aspire to settle questions between labour and capital. Things in dreams are not as they seem, but dreams now, as in old times, have their interpretations, and are sometimes guides to truth. The Churches may, perhaps, help to solve the labour problems, but not by putting up their ministers to hear evidence and to give judgment. Their part is rather to teach than to judge, and to give than to take evidence.

The public is the only potentate who can fill the place which the Pope grasped, and from its opinion there is no appeal. It is for the Churches (1) so to inspire the public that its judgment will be sound, and (2) then to offer the evidence on which it may exercise that judgment.

(1) The chief duty of the Churches to the world is to forward an ideal of life, to draw out admiration for noble, generous, and honest conduct, and to show the penalties which surely follow all forms of lying and selfishness. These duty has special applications, according as different subjects arise for the judgment of the public.

The labour problems, the rate of wages, the length of the working day, the rights of trades unions, the treatment of the unskilled, the weak and the old, press for settlement.

1 Reprinted by permission from the Review of the Churches.
POOR LAW REFORM

courage the authorities also to undertake one duty and do it well. Many are at present inadequately attempted. The arrangements, for instance, for giving country change for convalescents are of uncertain application. General hospitals and special hospitals compete with one another, and the care which has been found necessary for the eyes and teeth of the rich is not brought within reach of the ordinary working-man. If the Poor Law did offer to all people means of medical relief in ordinary cases of sickness, voluntary bodies could add the luxuries of nursing and change of air, or for special cases the special skill of a special hospital.

There is little doubt but that the reform of the Poor Law medical relief would be followed by the reform of the chaos into which the voluntary charitable medical relief has fallen.

THE CHILDREN

The Poor Law, when it is well administered, does perhaps all which any system can do for the well-being of children. It provides schools equal to any provided by charitable societies, it has introduced cottage homes, and no expense is spared to remove all suggestion of pauper or institution life. It has training homes for girls and training ships for boys, and it boards out in country villages the orphan and deserted children. Into these schools are freely received the children of widows and the disabled, the Guardians taking especial pains to keep all concerned clear of pauper contagion.

The education of children in institutions can never be satisfactory; but it is hard to say what improvement in Poor Law schools could be effected by any change of law. As public opinion becomes more intelligent the Government or Guardians will become also more intelligent, and as Christian devotion becomes bold enough to leave the shelter of its own homes and orphanages, the officials may oftener be those of a Christian spirit. It is on the increase of knowledge and of good-will rather than on law reform that the better welfare of the children depends.
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of 'imperial' questions so long as 'wages' questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. 'What,' said a speaker at a debate, 'was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.' They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy 'sweated' clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. 'Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,' is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. 'The nearer, the severer,' is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make 'too much of interest and too little of passions.' They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
religious disappointment may all be healed by higher wages, better drainage, and good order. Their own covetousness makes them exaggerate the covetousness of the Indians.

In the same way the alienation of labour and capital, the dislike shown by the agricultural labourers for kindly squires and honest parsons, the anger of employers against humane agitators, are due to the fact that each side, being covetous, has treated the other side as if it were covetous and nothing more.

Labour and capital think too much of interest and not enough of passion in dealing with one another. Conscious of being human, with human wants and hopes, each resents being treated as if interests were supreme; the labourer resents the attempt to buy him with a gift, while he is denied a voice in the parish council, and the employer knows the agitator does him wrong when he says that the only way of making him feel is through his pocket.

The public whose opinion has ultimately to settle the labour problems is made up of capitalists and labourers. To the public, therefore, the Churches must repeat Christ's message. Their ministers must show the failure of covetousness, the havoc it works in character, the misery, the poverty it brings in its train. But, chiefly, they must hold up for admiration that human life which makes everyone who is human turn from greed as from something foreign to his humanity. They will thus fit the public to decide between labour and capital.

(2) Their second duty is to present the facts on which judgment is to be formed. The Labour Commission is in one sense a reproach to the Churches; there ought to have been no need to discover by special inquiry how labour lives, is paid, and organises itself. The Churches of Christ exist that they may follow Christ, bring to light things which are hidden, and unite in one flock the many folds. If, when employers are charged with making a full life impossible for the labourers, they urge, 'We never knew,' and if, when labourers are charged with bringing lying accusations against the employers and
THE POOR LAW AS A CHARITABLE AGENCY

'Can any charity come out of a Board of Guardians?' a question likely to rouse as much scorn as a parallel query about Nazareth. Guardians have never escaped the reproach levelled at them in 'Oliver Twist.' Public opinion condescendingly regards them as the hard and official protectors of 'Bumble,' and Mr. Booth's preachers the Poor Law is often made matter for scorn.

The report of the Whitechapel Guardians just published makes therefore strange reading. Its table of contents shows that the Guardians, in addition to their ordinary administration of the infirmary and workhouse, deal in rescue work, children's country holidays, emigration, forlorn immigration, protection of children, and winter distress. It will be seen that their work is such as cannot be out of consideration in any scheme for helping the poor, and it raises the question whether the Poor Law must not be founded on which any such scheme is based.

With regard, for example, to rescue work, there is shelter in London so large as that afforded by the workhouse. It is here that women come when the shelters raised by a wave of passing emotion fail. It is here at some perilous period of their lives that the greater number of the poor men and women seek refuge. On this subject the Guardians say: 'Those who best know the East End of London, know how patiently and successfully the organised work

1 Reprinted, by permission, from Macmillan's Magazine, 1893
platform of the Church's floor and looked into one another's eyes at the Church's conference or meeting, when they have met at one another's houses and learnt, by what they see, how the others live, the employer will not any longer doubt that the workman has a mind, or the workman doubt that the employer has a heart.

The Churches by speech, in season and out of season, must teach the public how people live; they must give facts and figures, examples and instances. And, as knowledge comes by contact more than by hearsay, they must bring rich and poor together to enjoy the same pleasures, to discuss the same questions, to join in the same pursuits. They must in a very real sense make them neighbours before they can love others as they love themselves.

'War comes,' we are told, 'by misunderstanding.' This is true of the labour-war, and misunderstanding the Churches might do much to remove. Public opinion, inspired by a high ideal and instructed in the facts of life, would do most to settle the labour problems. It is indeed public opinion, and not force nor law, which largely fixes the rate of wages and the length of the working-day. English public opinion will not now allow workpeople to live as the Chinese live, or even to go barefoot. Public opinion might make it impossible for English workpeople to live without leisure for reading or recreation, without resources for health or travel, without room for decency or cleanliness, as it might make it impossible for English employers to surround themselves with luxuries, useless in the development of their own characters or in those of others.

The Churches have done much, but they have not educated public opinion in this direction. They have rather been ambitious, sometimes for the triumph of the doctrine they represent, sometimes for their ministers. They have seemed to the people to be anxious only to make proselytes, or to get a reputation of being peacemakers or arbitrators. 'Advertising parsons and peripatetic philanthropists' are the titles their ministers have earned. There are Churches whose members are
of the charitable. Good ladies have funds called after their own names, and they rival one another in their efforts to provide children a fortnight's fresh air.

The Guardians have not lagged behind in this movement, and they have sent a party of children from schools to enjoy holidays in the homes of cottagers living in the open country. In their necessarily formal language, they speak of 'the physical, mental, and moral advantage derived from the fortnight's stay,' but it is easy to imagine something of what lies behind that language. How the prim and proper, drilled and clean, stiff from the great dinner at Forest Gate, must have revelled in the freedom of cottage life! How interesting must have been the ways of family, how awakening the varied sights; how the mind of heart must have responded to new calls; how many memories must have been left to influence in after years the choice of a country life as against a life in town! The Guardians gave this 'physical, mental, and moral advantage,' certainly not to be omitted in a list of charitable agencies.

Emigration is another object undertaken by rival societies. In the report receives quiet and reasonable notice. A short paragraph it is stated that with the consent of the High Commissioner such and such persons have been sent in Canada, and reports follow showing that previous emigrants are doing well. The charity of the act is as the charity of rival societies. Miss A. and Mr. B., who advertise their intentions and collect large subscriptions, have done no more than the Guardians of Whitechapel have done; but it is questionable if any of the voluntary societies could give so adequate a complete a record of each individual emigrated.

There is an obvious danger in this sort of charity. It is easy to take the unknown for the successful, and to think because the poor are out of sight, they are therefore out of need. The sanguine and impatient temper of the philanthropist is hardly to be trusted in a matter where results are so far out of reach, and his supporters are too glad to have success to make any inquiries. The calm and official m
WHAT HAS THE CHARITY ORGANISATION SOCIETY TO DO WITH SOCIAL REFORM?¹

I feel not a little shy at speaking to so large and thoughtful a body of workers; and I should not have ventured to accede to Mr. Loch's proposal had I not felt myself to be an old friend of the Charity Organisation Society. I cannot say that I have ever seen its founder, neither was I present at its birth, but I was at its christening, when some long names were given; and later at its confirmation, I heard the duty undertaken, and indeed the declaration made, that the main object of its existence was 'to improve the condition of the poor.'

I am very proud of our friend; but, being a Charity Organiser, I can see his faults, of which, to my mind, one of the chief is that he has forgotten his baptism! I do not mean his name, but some of the promises then made for him. Far from forgetting his name, he thinks rather too much of it, having fallen into the aristocratic fault of believing a name more important than a character; and inasmuch as 'on what we dwell that we become,' he has run the danger—and we will not say wholly escaped it—of sacrificing the one to the other. He has, in short, unkindly ignored the thoughts and wishes of some of his god-parents. Have not his friends a right to be aggrieved?

We hear nowadays much about Social Reform, which,

¹ A Paper read at a meeting of members of the Charity Organisation Society, held at the Kensington Vestry Hall, on February 28, 1884.
be; he does not steal as you think he steals; he is at any rate a man, and he can be raised. Go on calmly. Deal with him as with your own fellow-citizens, and raise his standard of living.' Surely there is some confusion in these voices, and it is Charity which speaks in the name of Officialism.

One of the saddest of modern revelations is the cruel fate which children endure at the hands of their parents. It is a national disgrace that it should be necessary to found a national society for Preventing Cruelty to Children. Under the banner of that society, ardent men and women have been enlisted, and as yet their zeal seems to have given few signs of flagging or of extravagance.

The Guardians by their works deserve also to be enrolled among the protectors of children. They have done their work effectively. A recent Act of Parliament gives them power to adopt a child deserted by its parents and to keep it, if a boy, until the age of sixteen, and if a girl, until the age of eighteen. The Whitechapel Guardians have during the year used the power so as to take twenty-seven children under their care. These twenty-seven children, drawn from the crowded lodging-houses and furnished rooms which are the disgrace of a small area in the Whitechapel Union, may be boarded in country cottages, where, under the care of some mother woman, they will be trained in loving and in enjoying.

The process in its first stages is so protected that there can be no abuses either through the over-eagerness of the charitable or the changeableness of the poor. There can be no writs of Habeas Corpus to put an end to good work or to shake men's faith in the honest intentions of the philanthropist. In its latter stages the supervision is no less sustained and careful. The adopted child will not, because first friends are too busy or have died, become a slave-servant or be allowed to begin life unbefriended. The Guardians have a machinery which reaches far, and having put a child into the machine they are able to do effectively that which charity tries and often fails to do.

The winter distress brought into operation a new arm
declare in the strong tones of action that bread-stealing is more wicked than wife-beating? Or is the highest life made more possible by laws that allow so much of our great mother earth—God-blessed for the use of mankind—to be reserved for the exclusive benefit and enjoyment of the upper classes?

4. Division of Classes.—Love is the strongest force in the universe. At least the ancient teachers thought so when they renamed God, and left Him with the Christian name of Love. And yet the teacher who preached the gospel of love enunciated the doctrine of eternal damnation of the great majority of mankind. But love, a certain kind of love for which no other makes up, becomes impossible by the great division between classes. We cannot love what we do not know; it is as the American said, 'Oh, Jones! I hate that fellow.' 'Hate him?' asked his friend; 'why, I did not think you knew him.' 'No, I don't,' was the reply; 'if I did, I guess I shouldn't hate him.' The division between classes is a wrong to both classes. The poor lose something by their ignorance of the grace, the culture, and the wider interest of the rich; the rich lose far more by their ignorance of the patience, the meekness, the unselfconsciousness, the self-sacrifice, and the great strong hopefulness of the poor.

5. Besides these conditions, others exist, forming barriers and hindering a man from leading his true life, such as want of light, space, and beauty. The sunrising is to a large number of town livers only an intimation—and rarely an agreeable one—that they must get out of bed. It is but the lighting of a lamp, and not, as Blake said, the rising of an innumerable company of the heavenly host consecrating the day to duty by crying, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty.' And even if there is space to see the sky, there is still the absence of leisure to watch its unhurried changes. We all haste and rush, we hurry and drive. The very parlance of the day adopts new words to express despatch; and one dear old body whom I know, who is sixty years old and of appropriate proportions, constantly informs me that she 'flew' hither and thither—a method of locomotion which, in earlier years, I
no doubt about it that our friend is a very fine fellow), still
there are flaws both in his past and present constitution and
character which make his work less effective than it otherwise
might be. Briefly, his heart is not large enough for his body
—he circulation is slow—his movements are ponderous—and,
being slightly hard of hearing, he does not take in things until
some little time after other people have done so. Then, too,
he is somewhat a creature of habit; his mind does not readily
assimilate new ideas, and he does rather an unusual number
of things because 'he always has done so.' His raison d'être,
his whole work, is founded on the first word of his name—
Charity (which the new translators tell us we may call love,
if we like)—and yet he is sometimes curiously persistent in
'thinking evil,' and he hardly, I fear, 'hopeth all things,' nor
yet lives up to his standard of 'never failing'; or what does
463 cases thrown aside as 'undeserving and ineligible' mean
in this last month's returns of work?

Then he has an odd way of talking about his work. I
have often seen ordinary, commonplace, every-day sort of
people begin to listen to him with keen interest, but gradually
drop eyelids and lose sympathy as he threads his way through
investigations, organisations, registrations, co-operations, appli-
cations, administrations, each and all done by multiplication!

This is a pity, for of course the every-day sort of people
are most wanted to help him. He cannot only work with
people who have been cradled in blue-books and nourished
with statistics, nor yet with those who are like the man who
'did not care to look unless he could see the future.'

Some people dislike this faulty creature very much. They
see no good in him, and call him all sorts of hard names; but
then one is apt to find faults in large people more unbearable
than in little ones. Clumsy people, if big, are so very clumsy;
they tumble over the furniture, and kick the pet dog; and if
they do chance to tread on toes, it hurts so very much! and
that is partly the case with him. But he has virtues, and
plenty of them; he is not afraid of work, and he really cares
for the poor; he is exceedingly honourable about money; he
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of 'imperial' questions so long as 'wages' questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. 'What,' said a speaker at a debate, 'was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.' They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy 'sweated' clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. 'Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,' is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. 'The nearer, the severer,' is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make 'too much of interest and too little of passions.' They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
religious disappointment may all be healed by higher wages, better drainage, and good order. Their own covetousness makes them exaggerate the covetousness of the Indians.

In the same way the alienation of labour and capital, the dislike shown by the agricultural labourers for kindly squires and honest parsons, the anger of employers against humane agitators, are due to the fact that each side, being covetous, has treated the other side as if it were covetous and nothing more.

Labour and capital think too much of interest and not enough of passion in dealing with one another. Conscious of being human, with human wants and hopes, each resents being treated as if interests were supreme; the labourer resents the attempt to buy him with a gift, while he is denied a voice in the parish council, and the employer knows the agitator does him wrong when he says that the only way of making him feel is through his pocket.

The public whose opinion has ultimately to settle the labour problems is made up of capitalists and labourers. To the public, therefore, the Churches must repeat Christ's message. Their ministers must show the failure of covetousness, the havoc it works in character, the misery, the poverty it brings in its train. But, chiefly, they must hold up for admiration that human life which makes everyone who is human turn from greed as from something foreign to his humanity. They will thus fit the public to decide between labour and capital.

(2) Their second duty is to present the facts on which judgment is to be formed. The Labour Commission is in one sense a reproach to the Churches; there ought to have been no need to discover by special inquiry how labour lives, is paid, and organises itself. The Churches of Christ exist that they may follow Christ, bring to light things which are hidden, and unite in one flock the many folds. If, when employers are charged with making a full life impossible for the labourers, they urge, 'We never knew,' and if, when labourers are charged with bringing lying accusations against the employers and
on social duties, 'is charity in its broad and popular sense. Against this teaching there is now a kind of reaction. Of food and clothing have, we are told, their use. From high in authority the suggestion has come that dinners be provided for school children, and from others (who are not with authority), the demand comes that all wants be supplied by gifts.

Evil must, it seems to me, result from such a conception. Relief, if it is to be helpful, must follow and not precede friendship; it must strengthen and not weaken character. Good must have for its object the good and not the comfort of individuals. Dinners to children would be destructive to their life, and gifts from strangers would defraud a man of his power to do his duty.

Dives has his good things, but Lazarus has his good things also. It is easier to take from the poor man his energy and character and his simplicity of love than it is to give him the use of view and the pleasure of living which belong to wealth.

That evils exist is not to be denied, and no sensate account quite reveals the condition in which the poor Dock labourers who are happy if they get twelve shillings a week all the year round, tailoresses who are paid three shillings for making complete a boy's suit, these and many like endure evils not to be described in words. Money cannot certainly remedy some of these evils, and yet gifts of money have ever proved harmful to the recipients.

They speak truth who loudly proclaim the sufferings of poverty, the sorrow of mothers weeping for children killed by bad air or overwork, the joylessness of life without knowing or pleasure. They speak truth who tell the power of gift, they also speak truth who say that giving is cruel kindness, more likely to break up than to establish homes.

What, then, is to be done? To this I answer that it must continue, but their aim must be to develop charity. The lowest man is brother to the highest. Gifts must aim at developing the high in the low, at bringing out the manly qualities in those who live as animals. It is not by treat
platform of the Church’s floor and looked into one another’s eyes at the Church’s conference or meeting, when they have met at one another’s houses and learnt, by what they see, how the others live, the employer will not any longer doubt that the workman has a mind, or the workman doubt that the employer has a heart.

The Churches by speech, in season and out of season, must teach the public how people live; they must give facts and figures, examples and instances. And, as knowledge comes by contact more than by hearsay, they must bring rich and poor together to enjoy the same pleasures, to discuss the same questions, to join in the same pursuits. They must in a very real sense make them neighbours before they can love others as they love themselves.

‘War comes,’ we are told, ‘by misunderstanding.’ This is true of the labour-war, and misunderstanding the Churches might do much to remove. Public opinion, inspired by a high ideal and instructed in the facts of life, would do most to settle the labour problems. It is indeed public opinion, and not force nor law, which largely fixes the rate of wages and the length of the working-day. English public opinion will not now allow workpeople to live as the Chinese live, or even to go barefoot. Public opinion might make it impossible for English work-people to live without leisure for reading or recreation, without resources for health or travel, without room for decency or cleanliness, as it might make it impossible for English employers to surround themselves with luxuries, less in the development of their own characters or in those of others.

The Churches have done much, but they have not educated public opinion in this direction. They have rather been ambitious, sometimes for the triumph of the doctrine they represent, sometimes for their ministers. They have seemed to the people to be anxious only to make proselytes, or to get a reputation of being peacemakers or arbitrators. ‘Advertising parsons and peripatetic philanthropists’ are the titles their ministers have earned. There are Churches whose members are
workman by its absence of variety, by the small call it on his hope or fear. The man who might have found to be rest, and following his calling to be life, finds work a machine to be deadly. The doing which fills many but in the same way deadly. It follows a regular system, it do with a part, and not the whole, and it makes little upon the doer’s power of originating.

Modern doing, with its division of labour, and its in of competition, accomplishes great things, but none that modern doers are full of joy or life. By doing, have got the habits and the sorrows of slaves, and the to retire as slaves look to be free.

Doing accomplishes much, but doing is often deadly, in men the powers by which they could enjoy life and the.

How, then, will doing cease to be deadly? Simply things are done with rather than for people. Gover though it be of a kingdom, does not satisfy a man, but go though it be of a child, satisfies a god. Governing is for others, guiding is doing with others.

The Established Church is now wanting in life, and in its national mission because it aims at doing good for people, and not with or by the people.

Doing cannot be deadly when it is bound up with when human perversity rouses human ingenuity, human needs rouse human hopes and fears. This, I is true of all doing. Bodily exercise, intellectual trade, are deadly doing till all are done with others, in pathy with the many who are poor in pleasure, knowled in money. It is true (I speak from experience) of that which is called philanthropy.

The doing for the poor, which ends in a law or insti the doing which ends in a committee and a secretar doing which is done through agents, and at a distance the poor, is deadly. All help must be co-operation helper and the helped must be partners, and over the done must be the grasped hand. Doing which helps is the people, among friends; not for the people, among stra
There is a sadness unutterable which such doing could remove. Because such a little has been done with the people to carry out the laws in poor neighbourhoods, therefore it is they die of disease, bred of dirt and crowds. Because so little has been done to amuse people with people, therefore it is the lives of the majority are joyless. Because so little has been done to share the knowledge—the good and perfect gift which God has given to this age—therefore it is that in this Christian land God is unknown as the Source of life.

In our service of doing, let the rule be to serve by doing with the people.

Of such doing there may be no end, and of time to do it there is no lack. When so many have time to go round in an eddy of purposeless visits, time to labour at what profits no one, time to organise parties for those who invite again, time to make friends among the rich, there is time to do more with those whose needs call loudest.

The field of the world is white to the harvest; there is a strange drawing together of nations and classes. To do the will of God is the meat which nourishes men.

III. As to service by being.—All cannot give, all cannot do, but all can be. He who serves by being, gives the best service. It was Erskine’s life which made his chance greeting sink into the Scotch shepherd’s heart. It is the difference in what we are, which makes a difference in our work. ‘If a man be immoral,’ the other day wrote a well-known tutor, ‘its sign is on every paper he does, it destroys his work.’

Being is the measure of doing. It is they who are best who do best. The saviours of mankind have been the meek and lowly in heart, and the highest name for God is ‘I Am.’

God is not God, because He gives or because He does, but because His name, His character, His Being is love, He serves best who is most.

We live in troubled times. Our poets hear no voices such as the Psalmists heard. They do not so tell us of the God in our midst as to rouse songs of praise; they tell only of men who ‘bluster and cringe;’ of humanity ‘striving blindly and
achieving nothing;’ and of those who serve as ‘divid
faction, whose ranks have been broken.’

The tale is true. Why is it? It is because we has
served by being. It is through the good, men belie
goodness. Have we been righteous? It is through the
ful that the timid gain courage. Have we been hol
It is through the loving that men learn to love. Have we
loving? It is through the pure—the child, the woman
stainless man—that the world believes in purity. Has
been pure?

They who would serve have not been enough: they
rested content with success, with the amounts collect
their charity, with the institutions they have raised, with
position they have gained, with the extension of their
influence.

They have done indeed the work, but they were not
highest, as they substituted for the pleading figure of
the attraction of a charity fête: or as they drew follow
some burlesque of Christianity; or as they stirred active
appeals to party spirit, or extended Church influence by
macy. This want in their service has affected their work
as a base thought in the mind of an artist affects his pic

We must be more, and to be more we must more think of our ideal. Man is man because ‘he can mind.’
must mind our ideal. The common standard of righteous
is not high enough. A truly honest man aspires to do
than satisfy the requirements of the Bankruptcy Court
must do more than satisfy the requirements of conventional
respectability. Except our righteousness exceed that of
religionists and philanthropists, we cannot be as those
serve. It is not enough that we are approved of men;
our conduct is held to be irreproachable, our lives said
devoted, and our opinions orthodox. We must be more
for this we must be intent on, must ‘mind’ the highest
we know or can conceive. As it is ‘each half lives a hu
different lives.’ One thing only is needful, and that is
at the feet of—to be intent on, as Mary was—‘the Hi
and Best.’
I commend, therefore, to you more frequent prayer, not prayer which just asks, but the prayer which pierces the clouds of old words, which passes the stars which lighted our fathers’ ways, which will ’get to God.’ God is far other than we think and greater than our creeds. God, though, is not far off. It may be that He will be found in some Nazareth of science, of thought, of life, some Nazareth ‘whence cometh no good thing.’ God is near, the knowledge of to-day is His garment, the fire of men’s passion is His angel, and He rideth on the breath of their aspirations.

I commend to you the prayer which ‘minds that which is Best,’ and which will not let any good go without its blessing. I commend to you the heartfelt prayer which will leave you on your knees before Jesus Christ, saying, ‘My Lord and my God.’

I commend to you, too, the Holy Communion, not a mystery, but the communion which is intercourse with the good and true, the communion of saints.

Men are other than they seem. The rich are not such as the poor think; the poor are not such as the rich think.

The world seems cold while in every heart a fire of love is burning, and the times wax evil while in every one is a longing to be good.

I commend to you the Holy Communion which means knowing others, which gives knowledge to get knowledge, which is intercourse of soul with soul, of deep feeling with deep feeling, and of high longing with high longing. I commend to you a communion with one another, a brotherhood of common life, which will leave you saying, ‘Ever more we dwell in Christ and Christ in us.’

They who pray truly will learn of righteousness and love beyond our present imaginings. They who commune truly will learn of good in others of which they never dreamt. When we are intent on, mind, the righteousness in God and the good in man, then we shall be more, and our service of giving and doing will be the saving service of our Master.

Samuel A. Barnett.
remember, she reserved strictly for future and more heavenly purposes.

But enough has been said of the ills of society. We all know them. The hearts of some of us have been very sick for many a weary year. The hands of those who have sat on the height and watched the progress of the battle have become tired, and have been upheld only by faith and prayer. But reinforcements have arrived; friends for the poor have arisen; from all sides press forward willing volunteers, who say, 'Put us in our place. Let us do something. How can we break down these barriers—unloose the golden fetters of these imprisoned souls—or relieve the burdened shoulders of those pale dungeoned creatures? How are we to make strength out of union—to right wrongs, and give to every man the light by which to see to make his choice?'

If one is to carry heavy weights one must have trained muscles. If one is to reply one must know. The Charity Organisation Society is the watchman set on a hill, who by his very constitution has special facilities for giving an answer—and a wise one—to these questions. He has exceptional opportunities for knowing both the classes in which social reform is most needed, and knows them under the best conditions. The rich come to him with 'minds on hopefulness bent;' the poor come at a time when their hearts are sore, when their lives are troubled, when their sorrows have made them 'unmanfully meek,' and they are willing to lay their lives and circumstances bare to inquiring eyes. For fifteen years the one class has been meeting the other in the thirty-nine district offices provided by the society, and some 290,000 families have asked for succour when they have been either morally, physically, or circumstantially sick. Last year alone 14,182£ passed through the hands of this Director of Charity, and at this moment there are more than 2,000 men and women actively engaged in his work, while he records the names of nearly 8,000 subscribers whose money is an earnest of sympathy and potential working power.

But magnificent as this sounds, and is (for there can be
no doubt about it that our friend is a very fine fellow), still
there are flaws both in his past and present constitution and
character which make his work less effective than it otherwise
might be. Briefly, his heart is not large enough for his body
—he’s circulation is slow—he’s movements are ponderous—and,
being slightly hard of hearing, he does not take in things until
some little time after other people have done so. Then, too,
he is somewhat a creature of habit; his mind does not readily
assimilate new ideas, and he does rather an unusual number
of things because ‘he always has done so.’ His raison d’être,
his whole work, is founded on the first word of his name—
Charity (which the new translators tell us we may call love,
if we like)—and yet he is sometimes curiously persistent in
‘thinking evil,’ and he hardly, I fear, ‘hopeth all things,’ nor
yet lives up to his standard of ‘never failing’; or what does
468 cases thrown aside as ‘undeserving and ineligible’ mean
in this last month’s returns of work?

Then he has an odd way of talking about his work. I
have often seen ordinary, commonplace, every-day sort of
people begin to listen to him with keen interest, but gradually
drop eyelids and lose sympathy as he threads his way through
investigations, organisations, registrations, co-operations, appli-
cations, administrations, each and all done by multiplication!

This is a pity, for of course the every-day sort of people
are most wanted to help him. He cannot only work with
people who have been cradled in blue-books and nourished
with statistics, nor yet with those who are like the man who
‘did not care to look unless he could see the future.’

Some people dislike this faulty creature very much. They
see no good in him, and call him all sorts of hard names; but
then one is apt to find faults in large people more unbearable
than in little ones. Clumsy people, if big, are so very clumsy;
they tumble over the furniture, and kick the pet dog; and if
they do chance to tread on toes, it hurts so very much! and
that is partly the case with him. But he has virtues, and
plenty of them; he is not afraid of work, and he really cares
for the poor; he is exceedingly honourable about money; he
they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of 'imperial' questions so long as 'wages' questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. 'What,' said a speaker at a debate, 'was the empire to him? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets.' They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating, and themselves buy 'sweated' clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have, doubtless, excuses for their attitude. 'Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more,' is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment, and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The Churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is, at any rate, violently condemned; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The Churches, approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. 'The nearer, the severer,' is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is, perhaps, a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make 'too much of interest and too little of passions.' They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and
religious disappointment may all be healed by higher wages, better drainage, and good order. Their own covetousness makes them exaggerate the covetousness of the Indians.

In the same way the alienation of labour and capital, the dislike shown by the agricultural labourers for kindly squires and honest parsons, the anger of employers against humane agitators, are due to the fact that each side, being covetous, has treated the other side as if it were covetous and nothing more.

Labour and capital think too much of interest and not enough of passion in dealing with one another. Conscious of being human, with human wants and hopes, each resents being treated as if interests were supreme; the labourer resents the attempt to buy him with a gift, while he is denied a voice in the parish council, and the employer knows the agitator does him wrong when he says that the only way of making him feel is through his pocket.

The public whose opinion has ultimately to settle the labour problems is made up of capitalists and labourers. To the public, therefore, the Churches must repeat Christ's message. Their ministers must show the failure of covetousness, the havoc it works in character, the misery, the poverty it brings in its train. But, chiefly, they must hold up for admiration that human life which makes everyone who is human turn from greed as from something foreign to his humanity. They will thus fit the public to decide between labour and capital.

(2) Their second duty is to present the facts on which judgment is to be formed. The Labour Commission is in one sense a reproach to the Churches; there ought to have been no need to discover by special inquiry how labour lives, is paid, and organises itself. The Churches of Christ exist that they may follow Christ, bring to light things which are hidden, and unite in one flock the many folds. If, when employers are charged with making a full life impossible for the labourers, they urge, 'We never knew,' and if, when labourers are charged with bringing lying accusations against the employers and
tends through many folios, and bears witness to the di
and brutality to which men and women have fallen.
incidents related are of various kinds. Of some it
be a shame to speak. Some are of rows between
drunken, some of the escape of thieves protected by the
community and welcomed almost at every door, some of
strangers, some of dissoluteness shared in by boys,
girls, some of open vice. One of the last records
fight between women stripped to the waist, which, in the
hours of the morning, was enjoyed by many children;
August 1, an American lady who visited the district
notorious character being known through the States,' give
following account of her visit:—

'I saw two men attack a woman, one struck her a
bled profusely. Almost immediately after, the tw
fought. I stepped into a coach, and then a pol
came and stopped the fight. I said, "Sir, you shoul
arrived earlier." He answered, "Madam, these things
daily occurrence here."'

It is, indeed, because they are so common that they
little known. The police can get no charges; the suff
to-day is the wrong-doer of to-morrow; differences see
easily settled by fights than by the law, and all the pol
do is to prevent the fights having a fatal issue.

Such is the life led in the criminal district of White
To us who know that life, the murders seem the least
evils brought to light. That a maniac should act as a m
that having no reasonable object for his act he should
detection; that women should put themselves in su
ctions, and in consequence be killed—all this may be he
but the horror is not equal to that implied by the degr
and brutality of a whole community. The mere capt
this murderer seems to us, therefore, of less importan
the reform of the area in which the victims are pre
The area is described by the police as 'a plague spo
infects the neighbourhood, and it tends to spread
children seeing such sights as are common in the stree
platform of the Church's floor and looked into one another's eyes at the Church's conference or meeting, when they have met at one another's houses and learnt, by what they see, how the others live, the employer will not any longer doubt that the workman has a mind, or the workman doubt that the employer has a heart.

The Churches by speech, in season and out of season, must teach the public how people live; they must give facts and figures, examples and instances. And, as knowledge comes by contact more than by hearsay, they must bring rich and poor together to enjoy the same pleasures, to discuss the same questions, to join in the same pursuits. They must in a very real sense make them neighbours before they can love others as they love themselves.

'War comes,' we are told, 'by misunderstanding.' This is true of the labour-war, and misunderstanding the Churches might do much to remove. Public opinion, inspired by a high ideal and instructed in the facts of life, would do most to settle the labour problems. It is indeed public opinion, and not force nor law, which largely fixes the rate of wages and the length of the working-day. English public opinion will not now allow workpeople to live as the Chinese live, or even to go barefoot. Public opinion might make it impossible for English workpeople to live without leisure for reading or recreation, without resources for health or travel, without room for decency or cleanliness, as it might make it impossible for English employers to surround themselves with luxuries, useless in the development of their own characters or in those of others.

The Churches have done much, but they have not educated public opinion in this direction. They have rather been ambitious, sometimes for the triumph of the doctrine they represent, sometimes for their ministers. They have seemed to the people to be anxious only to make proselytes, or to get a reputation of being peacemakers or arbitrators. 'Advertising parsons and peripatetic philanthropists' are the titles their ministers have earned. There are Churches whose members are
on the side of capital, and there are churches whose members are on the side of labour, and the teaching of the ministers gets a bias from the members. The buildings do not afford a common meeting-place for rich and poor, nor the meetings a means of communion which would make one help the other. They are, indeed, often symbols of division rather than of unity, and the 'West End' church, with its luxuries of warmth, colour, sound, and eloquent preaching, has little in common with the 'East End' Church. The very charities of which the Churches boast are signs of their failure to create the charity which comes by knowledge. The rich give not as to brothers and sisters, but as to 'masses' who can be satisfied with penny dinners, old clothes, and shelters.

The Churches have not educated public opinion to beware of covetousness or to understand the facts of life. They have often rather themselves illustrated the force of covetousness. They have introduced class distinctions into places of worship, and have made charity a barrier and not a bond. They still, however, hold the field as educators, and with them it largely rests to solve the labour problems. They are still supreme in many departments of life, and each Church can show a record of work which must command attention. They are still the outward expression of the small voice which speaks in every man, and they still bear in them the marks of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Churches (or, as I would rather say, the Church) are therefore powerful, and when they make their buildings meeting-houses of rich and poor, their highest service a communion, and their chief doctrine the preaching of Christ, they may so educate public opinion as to settle for ever, on a stronger foundation than on a decision of an arbitrator, or even on a law, the rate of wages and the hours of labour.

Samuel A. Barnett.
WHAT HAS THE CHARITY ORGANISATION SOCIETY TO DO WITH SOCIAL REFORM?¹

I feel not a little shy at speaking to so large and thoughtful a body of workers; and I should not have ventured to accede to Mr. Loch’s proposal had I not felt myself to be an old friend of the Charity Organisation Society. I cannot say that I have ever seen its founder, neither was I present at its birth, but I was at its christening, when some long names were given; and later at its confirmation, I heard the duty undertaken, and indeed the declaration made, that the main object of its existence was ‘to improve the condition of the poor.’

I am very proud of our friend; but, being a Charity Organiser, I can see his faults, of which, to my mind, one of the chief is that he has forgotten his baptism! I do not mean his name, but some of the promises then made for him. Far from forgetting his name, he thinks rather too much of it, having fallen into the aristocratic fault of believing a name more important than a character; and inasmuch as ‘on what we dwell that we become,’ he has run the danger—and we will not say wholly escaped it—of sacrificing the one to the other. He has, in short, unkindly ignored the thoughts and wishes of some of his god-parents. Have not his friends a right to be aggrieved?

We hear nowadays much about Social Reform, which,

¹ A Paper read at a meeting of members of the Charity Organisation Society, held at the Kensington Vestry Hall, on February 28, 1884.
being interpreted, means, I suppose, the removal of certain conditions in and around society which stand in the way of man's progress towards perfection.

Every human being, surely, ought to be able to make a free choice for good or evil. It is, no doubt, possible for each of us to choose the higher or lower life 'in that state of life in which it has pleased God to call us'; but the condition of some states keeps the higher life very low.

The moralists may tell about the educating influence of resistance to temptations; but are not temptations strong enough in themselves without being buttressed by conditions? Even the most ingenious of Eve's apologists has never ventured to advance the view that she was hungry.

It should be a matter of man's free will alone that determines which life he lives. Social conditions, over which as an individual he has no power, now too often determine it for him, for there are forces in and around society which crush down the individual will of man, and which bind his limbs so tightly that not only his course, but too often his gait, has been determined for him.

1. Great Wealth.—Can a man live the highest life whose abundance puts out of daily practice the priceless privilege of personal sacrifice—from whom effort is undemanded—whose floors are padded should he chance to fall—whose walls, golden though they be, are dividing barriers, high and strong, between him and his fellowmen?

2. Great Poverty.—Can a man live the highest life when the preservation of his stunted, unlively body occupies all his thoughts—from whose life pleasure is crushed out by ever-wearying work—to whom thought is impossible (the brain needs food and leisure to set it going)—to whom knowledge, interpreting and revealing the Most High, is denied?

3. Unequal Laws.—Is a man wholly unfettered in his choice of life when his country's laws have allowed him to become a victim to unsanitary dwellings—when they permit him to sin, by providing that his wrong should (on himself) be resultless—when its ministers of justice, interpreting its laws,
declare in the strong tones of action that bread-stealing is more wicked than wife-beating? Or is the highest life made more possible by laws that allow so much of our great mother earth—God-blessed for the use of mankind—to be reserved for the exclusive benefit and enjoyment of the upper classes?

4. Division of Classes.—Love is the strongest force in the universe. At least the ancient teachers thought so when they renamed God, and left Him with the Christian name of Love. And yet the teacher who preached the gospel of love enunciated the doctrine of eternal damnation of the great majority of mankind. But love, a certain kind of love for which no other makes up, becomes impossible by the great division between classes. We cannot love what we do not know; it is as the American said, 'Oh, Jones! I hate that fellow.' 'Hate him?' asked his friend; 'why, I did not think you knew him.' 'No, I don't,' was the reply; 'if I did, I guess I shouldn't hate him.' The division between classes is a wrong to both classes. The poor lose something by their ignorance of the grace, the culture, and the wider interest of the rich; the rich lose far more by their ignorance of the patience, the meekness, the unselfconsciousness, the self-sacrifice, and the great strong hopefulness of the poor.

5. Besides these conditions, others exist, forming barriers and hindering a man from leading his true life, such as want of light, space, and beauty. The sunrising is to a large number of town livers only an intimation—and rarely an agreeable one—that they must get out of bed. It is but the lighting of a lamp, and not, as Blake said, the rising of an innumerable company of the heavenly host consecrating the day to duty by crying, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty.' And even if there is space to see the sky, there is still the absence of leisure to watch its unhurried changes. We all haste and rush, we hurry and drive. The very parlance of the day adopts new words to express despatch; and one dear old body whom I know, who is sixty years old and of appropriate proportions, constantly informs me that she 'flew' hither and thither—a method of locomotion which, in earlier years, I
Better laws can hardly be called an agency of hand, so long does it take to make the rival parties govern the country lay aside their rivalries and pass the which removes a real abuse.

Such a law would be one enabling the local author deal with an area morally insanitary as it does with physically insanitary, and perhaps more of the cost might thrown on those participating in the profits. By means to a law the area in question would long ago have been cut and the management put in the hands of those with the and the will to see right done. Under Lord Cross’s Act healthy areas in the neighbourhood have been cleared, and change wrought by landlords of good will is very mark.

Another law which is wanted is one to control the so ‘furnished lodgings.’ They are not technically houses of fame, and so they escape condemnation under the Acts against these houses. They are not in the occupation of person or persons who use them for immoral purposes are used by mere passengers, and an extension of the needed to check a use so low that it seems never to have contemplated as possible by previous legislators.

Further, the law which governs the management of mon lodgings might be improved. Lodgings should be lie only in houses of a fairly high rating—’doubles’ and ‘sitt should not be allowed under the same roof; the houses be on main thoroughfares, and the provision of more one common room and of sufficient offices should be ent

(b) BY ADMINISTRATION OF EXISTING LAW

The better administration of existing law is the es want of London. The streets in East London are ill-lit and ill-cleansed. Drunkenness goes on in the public-h the dirt and noise make life hard and joyless. Existing provide, when they were enforced by the Vestries, that shall be no dark corners tempting to vice by offering set from recognition; no filth in the streets to make house hopeless; no persons drunk because they have been:
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running the risks of meeting harmful wrong that I am going to speak.

For simplicity's sake, let me divide it into two groups—work which can be done at home, and work which can be done outside.

For home work there is sewing; and lately there has been set going in East London a clothing club on rather a new plan. Instead of meeting for an afternoon's needlework, the workers agree to make two, three, four, or six garments in a month, according to the time, capacity, &c., at their disposal. The clothes, already cut out, are sent to each worker, who makes them at her leisure and returns them to the secretary at the end of the month. Any girl can do this. It is dull, but helpful—distinctly helpful, as those of us who come face to face with the poor know; helpful to the pinched mother, who, no less careful of her daughter than the wealthy parent, finds 'no clothes' an insufferable barrier to getting her girl into 'good service'; helpful to the girl who does not want to be bad 'and mix with the rough uns,' but who, unhelped, almost must do so as long as social conditions, rate of wages, and the estimate of women be what they are.

Then there is painting. What shoals of Christmas cards we all get, and what becomes of them? They might be made into dadoes for the wards of workhouse schools. Those places are, as a rule, drear and barren. The children have nothing to look at, and the pause-time of illness loses half its value because the well known walls have no bright ideas to give the empty brains, no grand thoughts taught through mottoes or texts which may sink in and arise as watchwords in the future battle of life.

Any girl can arrange Christmas cards. The same cards in scrapbooks for the bedridden babes, if pasted on calico, and connected with painted flowers and sprays or quaint wood-work drawing, make admirable screens, or wall decoration as dadoes. They must be varnished if so used; but that need present no difficulty. The carpenter at the schools for which the gift is purposed will do that bit of technical work, and the same
would be less evil, and happily the breaking-up of a community as that which exists in Whitechapel must the scattering of the individuals. There is no district to the whole body could swarm, and in most districts individuals would find an atmosphere prejudicial to vicious

There is another advantage which would come to the themselves if the law were rigorously applied. They are what they are by indolence; they are in one sense the society, people who easily win gifts, men and women who been let off their duties. Their want is stern, rigorous ment, and the experience of being 'moved on' will be in way beneficial.

Sternness and kindness are fellow workers not often seen together. They who would help their neigh must be stern—absolutely resolute to give nothing ex response to effort, strict to bring home to each the his misdoing, deaf to all excuses why the thing which to have been done was left undone. They must be stern, they must be kind with the kindness born of the belief beneath the lies, the vice, the indolence, is the spark of which love may by patience cherish into a flame.

In a word, it is only the service of those in whom spirit of Christ which can effect any good. The of breaking up this criminal quarter is that the ind criminals may be brought within touch of the Ch influences of the day.

**THE NEEDS OF WHITECHAPEL**

Whitechapel, however, let it be once more repeated criminal. Its needs—if once the four acres were cleared, not to be met by police and missions. Whitechapel has needs which are real and pressing.

There are two sites besides the criminal quarter closest unhealthy, and closely inhabited by poor and ind people. They need to be cleared.

There are ignorant men and women who, labouring without holidays or leisure, have forgotten all the
evening, when I've done the work, out of my old things and some the missus gave me to cut up.' They were rather worn, she explained, but she thought they might be nice for some poor little child.

But if I begin on how to help our children-servants I shall never stop, so I had better go back at once to what helpful girls can safely do outside their homes.

They can do quantities of handwork. Cover books. One afternoon a week would keep a parish library tidy, and so by its neatness and order teach other lessons than the books themselves convey. Mend maternity bags. The baby clothes soon get out of order; two or three pairs of hands could keep them straight; and during the few weeks of such enforced rest there is time for the mother to note the needlework done by the unknown friends, and maybe get her standard raised thereby, though I fear that the old days, when 'to look at a lady's needlework did one good,' are gone for ever.

Then they can play; play in the playgrounds of the National or Board schools; teach games—games of skill, and not chance. If you watch the children in the streets, you will nearly always find that they are playing games of chance, fostering the gambling spirit which does so much to wreck patient work and well-ordered character. The lady-girls can teach games which, played under rule, become masters in the lessons of self-control. They might, by regular, hearty work, turn the London play-yards into what the playing fields of Eton and Harrow are—the places where the best seeds of character take root and sprout.

These playmates are drearily needed in the pauper schools; and here girls living in the suburbs (whose mothers are fearful of the perils of a short railway journey) can be specially useful, for the workhouse schools are nearly all in the suburbs. It is a little difficult to obtain admittance, for the Guardians are apt to look askance at 'ladies' interference,' as I am afraid they often and erroneously term our kindly efforts; but still the society, in response to whose request I am speaking to-day, might get over that barrier if they had a sufficient number
TRAINING FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

Three years ago London was startled by the evidence of a great 'fluid population.' The unemployed, by crowdings, riots, forced themselves into notice, and ever since there have been inquiries, investigations, and Commissions. Of these inquiries Mr. Booth's has been most to the purpose, having analysed the occupations of the inhabitants of London, estimates that out of a total of 908,000, about 300,000 men, women, and children—were dependent on casual employment. For the workers of this number, work is so irregular that a great part could easily be performed by those in the regular workers, and the majority of them may fairly be numbered among the unemployed. What is true of East London is probably true of South London, where, forgotten by fellow citizens, the poor are again congregating by themselves.

This great 'fluid population' makes a greater class of statesmanship than does even that of Irish discontent. For three years its presence has been evident, and the only statesmanship shown is that which puts off trouble by appealing to the Commissions of Inquiry.

Inquiry can add little to what is known. Masses of unemployed, who are ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-taught, frequently congregate; they may be seen at meetings, they gat

1 Reprinted from the Nineteenth Century of November 18
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in their hands; and to elevate the hopes, widen the interests, and raise the standard of our people's teachers is surely no mean task to offer to girls waiting to be helpful. The elder girls, too, repay teaching in extra and outside subjects, and it can be given at noon, if the teacher can make her lesson attractive enough to compete with the play hour, not an impossible feat, so eagerly do children devour news about their bodies, talk about scientific cookery, and star-gazing stories; or it can be carried on in club rooms and night schools. The former, perhaps, opens out the largest field for varied accomplishments, ranging as it does from stocking-mending and hat-trimming to letter writing and Bible philosophy.

But I will not weary you with more details. The things I have suggested may seem unimportant; they are not really so in their results. The young seedling is helped by many influences, some of them apparently insignificant, before it grows straight, and the girl who will give her time to forming some of the influencing surroundings of her younger and but little known relations, need not be surprised if, in after life, she finds such work blessed in the way she least expects but perhaps would most value—namely, in preventing vice and erecting barriers against impurity.

Help-willing girls will know that they can help. Handwork, head-work, heart-work, all are in demand if given simply and unaffectedly. Mothers will know that there is work which their girls can do without running unwise risks, work which will give their children a greater right to the enjoyment which they so lavishly, and rightly, provide for them, work which, apart from the satisfaction and fulness that comes by it into their own personal lives, will make them more able to call themselves followers of Him who has said, 'I am among you as one who serves.'

HENRIETTA O. BARNETT.
The dull, hopeless, shiftless, and sad life of the poor is known.

Whose is the fault that men and women are unclean and uncomforted? It is the fault of every selfish person the disgrace is to our common humanity.

But the existence of the unemployed is something more than even a disgrace; it is a danger to the well-being of society, leading the kind-hearted and the vain to all sorts of extravagance, and justifying the selfish in all sorts of dishonesty. Because of their presence, schemes of maulding panthropy or of ambitious vanity get a hearing. The kind-hearts pointing to their needs, demand gifts of free dinners, unrestricted out-relief. Talkers, moved by frantic vanity and unlimited suspicion, have it in their power to say: 'I see what comes of free trade, of monopoly property;' or of whatever other cause they themselves at the moment attacking. Because, too, the unemployed low life, the selfish are encouraged to go on saying, 'Nothing can be done,' till their hearts are hardened. A degrading means an oppressive class, and the end is a revolution means 'the death of the first-born.'

Far be it from me to say that this condition of things has been reached in London; but when one part of society content with a low life and another part of society is indifferent to that content, class warfare is not far distant. Three tens of thousands, with the thoughts and feelings of living the life of beasts, greedy for what they can get, care of the means of getting, rejoicing in low pleasures, and move a blind sense of injustice ready to take shape in foolish den and wild acts; there are, on the other side, thousands with knowledge that such lives are lived by their neighbours, go on making themselves comfortable and happy, and hardness of heart takes shape in Commissions, in lucid ex- tions over dinner tables that 'the statistics of pauperism no increase,' and in admirable reasons, founded on political economy, that 'nothing can be done.'

This state of things is dangerous. The unemployed
be driven by the police out of the thoroughfares, they may have no place in Poor Law returns, but their existence cannot be denied, and if their ignorance and their sense of injustice are allowed to increase, they may some day appear, to overturn not only the 'admirable administration of the Poor Law,' but also the very foundations of our trade and greatness. They—manifest, that is, in their misery and bitterness—may at some moment be the extra weight to turn the scale against free trade, in-door relief, or religion. The existence of the unemployed is a fact, and this fact constitutes a danger to the wealth and well-being of the community.

Alongside is another set of facts equally striking. Farms near London are going out of cultivation, and agricultural labourers are coming into the towns because there is no demand for their labour in the country. A farm, which is actually crossed by a railway, was recently offered at 5l. an acre, and other farms in Essex can be had for 10l. an acre. Certain economists view this state of things with equanimity; they say that the same causes which operate in other trades operate also in the farming trade, that land is going out of cultivation because cultivation does not pay, and that labour is wisely transferred to other occupations. But the question arises: 'Are we to accept the idleness of the land as we accept the idleness of the Spitalfield's loom? or are we to explain it as we explain the fact that there are many starving sempstresses while cloth waits to be made up for want of good sempstresses? In a word, is the idleness of the land to be taken as the result of progressive industry, or is it due to want of skill?'

The first answer will commend itself to those who believe that self-interest, left to its own devices, must discover the right road, and that the self-interest of farmers who have given up their farms and of labourers who have left their work must, after some pain during the period of transition, lead to a healthier state of things.

The second answer will commend itself to common minds, who know that vegetables, fruit, and poultry are brought into England, to the value of some millions of money yearly, which
any rate this great evil has come, that we have done evil and are made wicked thereby.

In judging, therefore, of methods of reform it is not enough to show that laws have been passed and leagues formed; it must also be shown that the character of all concerned is raised. Jesus drew few people after Him and died alone, but He so raised the character of man that His death inaugurated a permanent reformation of society. It is as the character of men is raised that all reforms become permanent.

Oppressed Nationalities depend for effectual help on the widely spread growth of sympathy with freedom; the poor will have starvation wages till the rich learn what justice requires; and religion will fail to be a power till men are honest enough to ask themselves in what they do really believe. Methods of reform are valuable just in so far as they tend to increase sympathy, justice, honesty, reverence, and all the virtues of high character. The answer, therefore, as to the end of this striving and crying of modern philanthropy is to be found in the effects which such methods have on character.

On the side of sensationalism it is urged (1) that laws and institutions are great educators. By the many laws against theft theiving has come to be regarded as the great crime, and by societies such as that for the prevention of cruelty to animals kindness has come to be a common virtue. If, therefore, it is argued, by some rough awakening of the public conscience, laws have been passed and institutions started, something is done to develop the higher part of character. ‘Principles,’ it has been said, ‘are no more than moral habits,’ and if agitation leads to laws which enforce moral habits, sensationalism may thus have the credit of forming principles which make character.

It is further urged (2) that, if association be the watchword of the future and the educational force of the new age, it is by noisy means that associations must be formed, because the trumpet note which is to draw men together from those parties and classes between which great gulfs are fixed must be one loud enough to strike the senses.

Lastly, it is said (3) that many whose imagination has
been made dull by the modern systems of education could never know the truth unless it were shown to them under the strongest light. They have been so rarely taught in schools to take pleasure in knowledge or to stretch their minds, they have so little accustomed themselves to think over what is absent or to trace effects to causes, that it is more often by ignorance than by selfishness that they are cruel. They have been so eager in managing their inheritance of wealth that they have failed to use their other inheritance—the power of putting questions. Such people, it is argued, hearing of atrocities, learning the cost at which wealth is made, and seeing the brutal side of vice, get such development of character that they question habits, customs, conditions which they before accepted, and become more just and generous.

On the other hand, against this use of sensationalism, keeping still in view the effects on character, it is urged (1) that actions caused by the excitement of the emotions before they can be supported by reason are followed by apathy. The people who became ‘frantic’ at the tale of the Bulgarian atrocities have since heard almost with equanimity of suffering as terrible. The many who wrote and spoke of the bitter lot of the poor hardly give the few pounds a year required to keep alive the Sanitary Aid Society, which was started to deal with what was allowed to lie nearest the root of the bitterness—the ill-administered laws of health. The leaders of the Salvation Army, pursued by this fear of apathy, have continually to seek new forms of excitement, just as politicians have to seek new cries.

Such examples seem to show that the wave which is raised by the emotions must fall back unless it is followed by the rising tide of reason, and that the effect on character of neglecting the reason is to make it unfeeling and apathetic. According to Rossetti’s allegory, they who are stirred by the sight of vice become, like those who look on the Gorgon’s head, hardened to stone.

Let not thine eyes know
Any forbidden thing itself, although
It once should save as well as kill; but be
Its shadow upon life enough for thee.
The emotions, certainly, cannot be strained without loss. Of the greatest English actress it is told that she paid in old age the price of early strain on her feelings 'by weariness, vacuity, and deadness of spirit.'

It is urged further on the same side, (2) that the advertisement which is said to be necessary to promote association promotes only organisation, or that if it does promote association, it fills it also with the party spirit, which is a corrupting influence.

Organisations, we have been lately told, are weakening real charitable effort. They have at once the strength and the weakness of the standing army system, they produce a body of officials keen to carry out their objects and careless of other issues, and they release individuals from the duty of serving the need they have recognised. That the sensational method of rousing the charitable activities has resulted in organisation rather than in association may be seen by reference to the Charities Register, with its long record of new societies and institutions. That it also inspires with party spirit the associations which it forms is more difficult of proof. But strong statements which are necessary to advertisement can hardly be fair statements, and loud statements can rarely be exhaustively accurate. Where there is in the beginning neither fairness of feeling nor accuracy of thought, there will be afterwards a repetition of the old theological hatred.

'Ye know not what spirit ye are of,' said Christ to His disciples, who, ignorant of His purpose, would have used force against the Samaritans. The same party spirit still sometimes inspires those who hold grand beliefs and support great causes, the height and depth and breadth of which they have had neither time nor will to measure; and such a spirit degrades their character. It is not a gain to a man to be a Christian or a Liberal if by so doing he becomes certain that there is no right nor truth on the side of a Mohammedan or of a Tory. He has not, that is, risen to the height of his character: rather, as Mr. Coleridge says, 'He who begins by
loving Christianity better than the truth will proceed by loving his own sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all." A teetotaller will not add so much to society by his temperance as he will take away from society if his character becomes proud or narrow.

Party spirit—the spirit, that is, which is roused and limited by some hasty view of truth or right—is likely to make men unjust and cruel, and so a method of reform which produces this spirit cannot be approved. In the name of the grandest causes, missionaries were in old times cruel, and philanthropists are in modern times often unjust.

Lastly, (8) those who have claimed that sensationalism has led to the passing of some useful law have been met by the paradox that laws and institutions rarely exist till they have ceased to be wanted. In England public opinion condemns cruelty to animals, and so a society has been created. In Egypt, where the need is greater, but where there is no public opinion to condemn the cruelty, there is no society. Certain it is, at any rate, that the statute-book is cumbered with laws passed in a moment of moral excitement which remain without influence because they have never represented the true level of public opinion.

Where arguments are so urged for and against sensationalism it may be useful if, out of thirteen years' experience of East London life, I shortly collect what seem to be some of the changes in character which have appeared during this period.

The first change which is manifest is greater humanity in the richer classes. This is shown not only by talk, by drawing-room meetings, and by newspaper articles, but by actual service among the poor. The number of those who go about East London to do good is largely increased. But the increase is, I believe, greatest among those philanthropists who aim to apply principles rather than to provide relief. There have always been people of good-will ready to give and to teach; there is now an increase in their numbers, but the marked increase is among those who, following Mrs. Nassau Senior, work registry offices on the
principle that friends are the best avenues by which young girls can find places; or, following Miss Octavia Hill, become rent collectors, on the principle that the relation of landlord and tenant may be made conducive to the best good; or, following Miss Nightingale, take up the work of nursing, on the principle that the service of the sick is the highest service; or, following the founders of the Charity Organisation Society, examine into the causes of poverty, on the principle that it is better to prevent than to cure evil; or, following Miss Miranda Hill, give their talents to making beauty common, on the principle that rich and poor have equal powers of enjoying what is good; or, following Edmund Denison, come to live in East London and do the duties of citizens, on the principle that only they who share the neighbourhood really share the life of the poor. In all these cases the increase began more than thirteen years ago, and it must be allowed that the development of humanity which they represent is not of that form which can as a rule be traced to the use of sensationalism.

Another change I notice as generally present is increase of impatience.

The richer classes seeing things that have been hidden, and ignorant that any improvement has been going on, have taken up with ready-made schemes. Irritated that the poor should find obstacles to relief in times of sickness, they, in their hurry, give the pauper a vote, but leave him to get his relief under degrading conditions. Angry that children should be hungry, but too anxious to consider other things than hunger, they start an inadequate system of penny dinners which keeps starvation alive. Stirred by the news of uninhabitable houses, and insanitary areas, and brutal offences, they pass stringent laws and take no steps to see that the laws are administered. Affected by the thought that the majority of the people have neither pleasure-ground, nor space for play, nor water for cleanliness, they raise a chorus of abuse against London government, but do not deny themselves every day the bottle of wine or the useless luxury which would give
to Kilburn a park or to East London a People’s Palace. Hearing that the masses are irreligious, means are supported without regard as to what must be the influence on thoughtful men of associating religion with things which are not true, nor honourable, nor lovely, nor of good report.

On all sides among persons of good-will there seems to be the belief that things done for people are more effective than things done with people. There is an absence of the patience—the passionate patience—which is content to examine, to serve, to wait, and even to fail, so long as what is done shall be well done.

The same impatience which takes this shape among the richer classes is, I think, to be seen among the poorer classes in a growing animosity against the rich for being rich. Strong words and angry threats have become common. All suffering and much sin are laid at the doors of the rich, and speakers are approved who say that if by any means property could be more equally shared, more happiness and virtue would follow. Schemes, therefore, which offer such means are welcomed almost without inquiry. Artisans, roused by what they hear of the state in which their poorer neighbours live, misled often by what they see, do not inquire into causes of sin and sorrow. Scamps and idlers come forward with cries which get popular support, and the mass of the poor now cherish such a jealous disposition that, were they suddenly to inherit the place of the richer classes, they would inherit their vices also, and make a state of society in no way better than the present.

There may be such a thing as a noble impatience, but the impatience which has lately been added to character of both rich and poor is not such as to make observers sanguine of the social reform which it may accomplish. The old saying is still true, ‘He that believeth shall not make haste.’

The other change in character which has become manifest is one at which I have already hinted. It is a growing disposition among all classes to trust in ‘societies,’ whose rules become the authority of the workers and whose extension
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As a final argument it is said that if Guardians employ men on a training-farm, the belief will be encouraged that it is the duty of the State to find work for the unemployed. In answer to which it must be repeated that the object of the farm is not to give work but to give training. The Guardians do already teach such trades as carpentering, baking, and mat-making: there can hardly be such a distinction between working on the produce of the land and on the land itself as to condemn the latter as dangerous. The Standard, commenting on the proposal, says, 'An experiment for so well-defined a purpose, and conducted strictly on the principle of making all paupers work hard for their living, would be little likely to be confounded with such pernicious establishments as the national workshops of political dreamers.'

With every sympathy, therefore, for the objects of those who dread lest Poor Law relief should affect the independence of the people, I submit that the establishment of a training-farm is not open to the objection that it is false to the principle of Poor Law reform.

Whether the direction of such a farm shall be in official or voluntary hands must be settled simply on practical grounds. For either there is much that may be urged. The Guardians have an established position, the command of money, and they do all their work under the public eye. A voluntary
becomes the aim of their work. Men give all their energies to get recruits for their 'army,' recognition for their clubs, and more room for their operations. 'Societies' seem thus to be very fountains of strength, and the only method of action. Bishops aim to strengthen the Church by speaking of it as a 'society,' and individual ministers try to keep their parishes distinct with a name, an organisation, and an aim which are independent of other parishes. The lovers of emigration have for the same reason grouped themselves in no less than fourteen societies, and it seems to have required the creation of three large societies to give music to the people.

A 'society' has indeed taken in many minds the place of a priest, its authority has given the impetus and the aim to action, but it has tended to make those whom it rules weak and bigoted. I see, therefore, in the members of these societies much energy, but less of the spirit which is willing to break old bonds and to go on, if need be, in the loneliness of originality, trusting in God. I see much self-devotion, but more also of the spirit of competition, more of the self-assertion which yields nothing for the sake of co-operation.

If now I had to sum up what seems to me to be the effect on character of the method of striving and crying, I should say that the possible increase of humanity is balanced by increase of impatience, by sacrifice of originality, and by narrowness. Whether there is loss or gain it is impossible to say, but it will be useful, considering the end in view, to see how the most may be made of the gain and the least of the loss.

The end to be aimed at is one to be stated in the language either of Isaiah or of the modern politician. We all look for a time when there shall be no more hunger nor thirst, when love will share the strength of the few among the many, and when God shall take away tears from every eye. Or, putting the same end in other words, we all look for a time when the conditions of existence shall be such that it will be possible for every man and woman not only to live decently, but also
to enjoy the fulness of life which comes from friendships and from knowledge.

For such an end all are concerned to work. Comparing the things that are with the things that ought to be, some may strive and cry, others may work silently, but none can be careless.

None can approve a condition of society where the mass of the people remain ignorant even of the language through which come thought, comfort, and inspiration. The majority are, as it were, deaf and dumb. The mass of the nation cannot ask for what their higher nature needs, and cannot hear the Word of God without which man is not able to live. None can approve a condition of society where, while one is starving, another is drunken; where in one part of a town a man works without pleasure to end his days in the workhouse, while in the other part of the town a man idles his days away and is always 'as one that is served.' None can look on and think that it always must be that the hardest workers shall not earn enough to secure themselves by cleanliness and by knowledge against those temptations which enter by dirt and ignorance, while many have wealth which makes it almost impossible for them to enter the kingdom of God. A time must come when men shall hunger no more, nor thirst any more, when there shall be no tears which love cannot wipe away, and no pain which knowledge cannot remove. For this end everyone who knows 'the mission of man' must by some means work.

That all may avoid the loss and secure the gain which belongs to their various methods, it seems to me that they would be wise to remember two things—(1) that national organisations deserve support rather than party organisations, and (2) that the only test of real progress is to be found in the development of character.

A national organisation is not only more effective on account of its strength and extent, but also on account of its freedom from party spirit. Its members are bound to sit down by the side of those who differ from themselves, and are thus
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close connection with teachers and children. They could show the teachers what is implied in knowledge, introduce books of wider views, and they could visit the children's homes, arrange for their holidays, and see to their pleasures. Much more important is it that the schools under the nation's control should be good than that special schools should be started to achieve certain results. In connection, too, with the Board it is possible to have night classes, which should be in reality classes in higher education, and means both of promoting friendship and gaining knowledge.

Then there are the municipal bodies, the Vestries and Boards of Works, which largely control the conditions which people of goodwill strive to improve. It rests with these bodies to build habitable houses and to see that those built are habitable, and they are responsible for the lighting and cleaning of the streets. It is in their power to open libraries and reading-rooms, to make for every neighbourhood a common drawing-room, to build baths, so that cleanliness is no longer impossible, and perhaps, even to supply music in open spaces. It is by their will, or rather by their want of will, that the houses exist in which the young are tempted to their ruin, and it only needs their energy to work a reform at which purity societies vainly strive.

Lastly, there is the national organisation which is the greatest of all, the Church, the society of societies, the body whose object it is to carry out the aim of all societies, to be the centre of charitable effort, to spread among high and low the knowledge of the Highest, to enforce on all the supremacy of duty over pleasure, and to tell everywhere the Gospel which is joy and peace. If the Church fulfilled its object, there would be no need of societies or of sects. If the Church fails, it is because it is allowed to remain under the control of a clerical body; its charity tends thus to become limited, its ideas of duty are affected by its organisation, and it preaches not what is taught by the Holy Spirit, who is 'The Giver of life' now, as in the past, but it teaches only what its governing body remembers of the past teaching of that Spirit. All
The times are going on in the place of appointment. The climate, although at the depression, is not such as to make the work easy. It is not, however, a movement of human body which may be seen in the written words. It may be by the mere attendance. It may be the interest in the material, the interest in the earnings. But the idea is well with the interest of the reader, and will exist.

It is true that a part of the material is well written. It is the assumption that there is a material which is well written, and that no one is able to choose. It may be the interest of social study. The material is, however, all written in the same way. It may be the interest of the development of the material, or the interest of the material, or the interest of the material, or the interest of the material.
covered them, and had begun to apply remedies unthought of by the impatient. He has won no name, made no appeal, started no institution, and founded no society, but by him characters have been formed which are the strength of homes in which force is daily gathering for right. The women, too, whose work has borne best fruit are those who, having the enthusiasm of humanity, have had patience to wait while they work. After ten years such women now see families who have been raised from squalor to comfort, and are surrounded by girls to whom their friendship has given the best armour against temptation.

Their work has been great because it has strengthened character, and there are other fields in which like work may be done. Conditions have a large influence on character, and the hardships of life may be as prejudicial to the growth of character as the luxuries. They, therefore, who work to get good houses and good schools, who provide means of intercourse and high teaching, who increase the comforts of the poor, may also claim to be strengthening character. One I know who, by patient service on boards, has greatly changed some of the conditions under which 50,000 people have to live. He has never advertised his methods nor collected money for his system; he has simply given up pleasure and holidays to be regular at meetings; he has at the meetings, by patience and good temper, won the ear of his fellows, while by his inquiries into details and by his thorough mastery of his subject he has won their respect. A change has thus been made on account of which many have more energy, more comfort, and more hope.

One other I can remember who, even more unknown and unnoticed, came to live in East London. He gathered a few neighbours together, and gradually in talk opened to them a new pleasure for idle hours. They found such delight in seeing and hearing new things that they told others, and now there are many spending their evenings in ways that increase knowledge, who do so because one man aimed at providing means of intercourse and high teaching.
of true anger. He speaks of Lazarus who had died and was called to life. The man, he says, to whom "on earth he had been opened" ever after saw things in other colours. "Discourse of prodigious armaments or of the passing mule, 'tis one. Speak of some trifling fact, he will gaze and catch prodigious import. Should his child sicken unto death, why look for scarce abatement of his cheerfulness, word, gesture, glance from that same child will start to an agony of fear—exasperation just as like."

The man i.e. who had seen God saw things in other proportion than popular reformers see them. His anger was roused by the prodigious armaments of capital or of land, it was not moved by the child's death but by some trifling by the silent growth of suspicion, by the greedy, the grasping.

It is for want of seeing God as Lazarus saw Him, modern Christianity is so often emasculate and sentimental and that modern reform lacks the necessary anger.

Amid the satisfaction roused by fuller churches, by clad and by better ordered people, there remains the fact that there is no greater love of truth, no truer sense of justice, more reverence—lest the humble and meek who are exalted may not prove even more selfish and more tyrannical than the high and mighty who are being cast down.

God forbid that the reforming energy should be checked. The contrast between East London and West London, between the circumstances of the poor and of the rich, is disgraceful to our humanity. The contrast between the places in which the rich worship, and the places, mean, dirty, and ill-ordered in which the poor worship. The contrast between well-streets with their fine buildings and the signs of varied life added to narrow dreary passages lined by mean houses and used by a monotonous crowd. The contrast between the resources and leisure possible for the inhabitants of one half of London, and those possible for the other half. God forbid that the reforming energy which destroys this contrast should be checked.
PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM

Some time ago I met in a tramcar a well-known American clergyman. 'Ah!' said he, 'ten years' work in New York as a minister at large made me a Christian socialist.' The remark illustrates my own experience.

Ten years ago my wife and I came to live in East London. The study of political economy and some familiarity with the condition of the poor had shown us the harm of doles given in the shape either of charity or of out-relief. We found that gifts so given did not make the poor any richer, but served rather to perpetuate poverty. We came, therefore, to East London determined to war against a system of relief which, ignorantly cherished by the poor, meant ruin to their possibilities of living an independent and satisfying life. The work of some devoted men on the Board of Guardians, helped by the members of the Charity Organisation Society, has enabled us to see the victory won.

In this Whitechapel Union there is no out-relief, and 'charity' is given only to those who, by their forethought or their self-sacrifice, awaken the feelings of respect and gratitude which find a natural expression in giving and receiving presents. The result has not disappointed our hope. The poor have learnt to help themselves, and have found self-help a stronger bond by which to keep the home together than the dole of the relieving officer or of the district visitor. The rates have been saved 6,000l. a year, and that sum remains in

1 Reprinted, by permission, from the Nineteenth Century of April 1883.
crucify the good, and drive joy out of the world; they which abide when poverty, disease, and death passed.

When we get away from the rival promises of parties from pictures of misery and poverty drawn by reforms hurry, away from the appeals to pity. When we stand Cross and gaze into eternity, the excuses we make to ourselves and others will sound empty and false. We, the flames of the cleansing fire, will be stern with sin whatever it be—in ourselves or in others. We shall each humbly with real meaning say, 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' and we shall be better reformers of the wrongs of our
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to provide for pleasure, for old age, or even for the best medical skill. There can be for him no quiet hours with books or pictures, while his children or friends make music for his solace. He can invite no friends for a Christmas dance; he can wander in the thought of no future of pleasure or of rest. England is the land of sad monuments. The saddest monument is, perhaps, 'the respectable working man,' who has been erected in honour of Thrift. His brains, which might have shown the world how to save men, have been spent in saving pennies; his life, which might have been happy and full, has been dulled and saddened by taking 'thought for the morrow.'

This ought not so to be, and this will not always be. The question therefore naturally occurs, 'Why should not the State provide what is needed?' This is the question to which the Socialist is ready with many a response.

Some of his suggestions, even if good, are impracticable. It may be urged, for instance, that relief works should be started, that State workshops should be opened, and starvation made impossible. Or it may be urged that the land should be nationalised and large incomes divided. To such suggestions, and to many like them, it is a sufficient answer that they are impracticable. Their attainment, even were it desirable, is not within measurable distance, and to press them is likely to distract attention from what is possible. If a boy who goes out 'in the interest of the fox' can spoil a hunt by dragging a herring across the scent, a well-meaning socialist may hinder reform by drawing a fair fancy across the line of men's imagination.

All real progress must be by growth; the new must be a development of the old, and not a branch added on from another root. A change which does not fit into and grow out of things that already exist is not a practicable change and such are some of the changes now advocated by socialists upon platforms.

The condition of the people is one not to be long endured, but the answer to the question, 'What can the State do?'
might, according to this definition, be a statement of a principle to say that the remedy for the sadness of English labour is to be sought in letting the State provide for a man's needs while he is left to provide for his own wants. It is, however, a statement which, depending on an arbitrary and shifting definition, would not be understood. If, as another statement of a principle, it be said that means of life may be provided, while for means of livelihood a man must work, then it becomes difficult to draw a distinction, for some means of life are also means of livelihood. There is no principle as yet stated according to which limits of State interference may be defined.

The better plan is to consider the laws which are accepted as laws of England, and to study how, by their development, a remedy may be found. On the statute book there are many socialistic laws. The Poor Law, the Education Act, the Established Church, the Land Act, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, and the Libraries Act are socialistic.

The Poor Law provides relief for the destitute and medical care for the poor. By a system of out-door relief it has won the condemnation of many who care for the poor, and see that out-door relief robs them of their energy, their self-respect, and their homes. There is no reason, however, why the Poor Law should not be developed in more healthy ways. Pensions of 8s. or 10s. a week might be given to every citizen who had kept himself until the age of 60 without workhouse aid. If such pensions were the right of all, none would be tempted to lie to get them, nor would any be tempted to spy and bully in order to show the undesert of applicants. So long as relief is a matter of desert, and so long as the most conscientious relieving officers are liable to err, there must be mistakes both on the side of indulgence and of neglect.

The one objection to out-relief, which is at present recognised by the poor, is that the system puts it in the power of the relieving officer to act as judge in matters of which he must be ignorant, so that he gives relief to the careless or crafty, and passes over those who, in self-respect, hide their trouble.
Pensions, too, it may be added, would be no more corrupting to the labourer who works for his country in the workshop than for the civil servant who works for his country at the desk, and the cost of pensions would be no greater than is the cost of infirmaries and almshouses. In one way or another the old and the poor are now kept by those who are richer, and the present method is not a cheap one.

Many men and women fail because they do not know how to work. The workhouses might be made schools of industry. If the ignorant could be detained in workhouses until they had learnt the use of a tool and the pleasure of work, these establishments would become technical schools of the kind most needed, and yearly add a large sum to the wealth of the nation.

Lastly, the whole system of medical relief might be so organised as to provide for every citizen the skill and care necessary for his cure in sickness. As it is, no labourer nor artisan is expected to make such provision, since there are hospitals, infirmaries, and dispensaries to supply his wants. By application or by letter he can gain admission to any of these, and he is expected to be grateful. Medical relief is thus supplied; to organise the relief is merely to take another step along a path already entered, and properly organised the relief need not pauperise. The necessity of begging for a letter, the obligation of humbly waiting at hospital or dispensary doors, the chance that real needs may be unskilfully treated—these are the things which degrade a man. If all the dispensaries, hospitals, and infirmaries were properly ordered, controlled by the State, and open as a matter of right to all comers, it would be possible for every citizen at the dispensary to get the necessary advice and medicine, and thence, if he would, to enter a hospital without any sense of degradation. The national health is the nation's interest, and without additional outlay it could be brought about that every man, woman, and child should have the medical treatment necessary to their condition. The rich would still get sufficient advantage, but it would no longer happen that the lives most useful to the nation would
be left to the care of practitioners who, however kind and devoted, cannot provide either adequate drugs or spare the time for necessary study when for visit and drugs the charge cannot be more than 1s. or 1s. 6d.

By some such development as these suggested, without any break with old traditions, without any fear of pauperising the people, the Poor Law might help to make the life of England healthier and more restful.

In the same way the Education Act might be developed in conjunction with the Church and the Universities to make the life of England wiser and fuller. A complete system of national education ought to take the child from the nursery, pass him through high schools to the University, and then provide him with means to develop the higher life of which all are capable. Some steps have already been made in this direction, but secondary schools or high schools are still needed, and the Church organisation will have to be made popular, so as to represent, not the opinions of a mediæval sect, but the opinions of nineteenth-century Englishmen. Schools in which it would be possible to learn the facts and thoughts new to this age, Churches in which, by ministers in sympathy with their hearers and by the use of forms native of the times, men could be lightened with light upon their souls, would add an untold quantity to the sum of national life.

Alongside of such development much might be done with the Libraries Act and with the powers which local bodies have to keep up parks and gardens. It would be as easy to find in every neighbourhood a site for the people's playground as it is for the workhouse, and all might have, what is now the privilege of the rich, a place for quiet, the sight of green grass and fair flowers. It would be as easy to build a library as an infirmary. In every parish there might be rooms lighted and warmed, where cosy chairs and well-filled shelves might invite the weary man to wander in other times and climes with other mates and minds. In every locality there might be a hall where music, or pictures, or the talk of friends would call into action sleeping powers, and by admiration
arouse the deadened to life. The best things gain nothing by being made private property; a fine picture possessed by the State will give the individual who looks at it as much pleasure as if he possessed it. It is no idle dream that the Crystal Palace might become a national institution, open free for the enjoyment of all, dedicated to the service of the people, for the recreation of their lives, by means of music, knowledge, and beauty.

If still it be said that none of these good things touch the want most recognised, the need of better dwellings, then we have in the Artisans’ Dwellings Act a law which only requires wise handling to be made to serve this purpose. A Local Board has now the power to pull down rookeries and to let the ground at a price which will enable honest builders to erect decent dwellings at low rents. Unwisely handled, the law may only destroy existing dwellings, and put heavy compensation into the pockets of unworthy landlords and fees into those of active officials; wisely handled, the same law may at no very great expense replace the houses which now ruin the life of the poor and disgrace the English name.

Thus it is—and other laws, such as the Irish Land Act, are open to the same process of development—that without revolution reform could be wrought.

I can conceive a great change in the condition of the people, worked out in our own generation, without any revolution or break with the past. With wages at their present rate I can yet imagine the houses made strong and healthy, education and public baths made free, and the possibility of investing in land made easy. I can imagine that, without increase of their private wealth, the poor might have in libraries, music-halls, and flower gardens that on which wealth is spent. I can imagine the youth of the nation made strong by means of fresh air and the doctor’s care, the aged made restful by means of honourable pensions. I can imagine the Church as the people’s Church, its buildings the halls where they are taught by their chosen teachers, the meeting-places where they learn the secret of union and brotherly love, the houses of prayer where, in the presence of the Best, they lift themselves into the higher life of duty and
devotion to right—all this I can imagine, because it is practicable.

I cannot imagine that which must be reached by new departures and so-called Continental practices. Any scheme, whatever it may promise in the future, which involves revolution in the present is impracticable, and any flirting with it is likely to hinder the progress of reform.

But now there rises the obvious objection, 'All this will cost much money;' 'Free education means 1d. in the pound; libraries and museums mean 2d.;' 'The suggested changes would absorb more than 1s.; the ratepayers could not stand it.'

I agree; the present ratepayers could not pay heavier rates. There must be other means of raising the money. Some scheme for further graduated taxing is possible; while the wealth locked up in the endowed charities, the increase which would be brought to the revenue by a new assessment of the land-tax, and the sum which might be saved by abolishing sinecures and waste in every public office would meet a great part of this need.

The wealth of the endowed charities has never been realised, and if that amount be not reduced in paying for elementary education, it might do much to make life happier. If men saw to what uses this money could be put, they would not be so ready to back up an agitation raised on the School Board to get hold of this money for School Board work. They would say, 'No; the schools are safe; in some way they must be provided and paid for. We won't shield the Board from attacks of ratepayers by giving them our money to spend; we want that for things which the Board cannot provide.'

There is also a vast sum which might be got by a new assessment—which in some cases would be a re-imposition—of the land-tax, and by a closer scrutiny into the ways of public offices. The land-tax returns the same amount as it returned more than two hundred years ago, while rents have gone on increasing. The abuses of sinecures and of useless officials are patent to all who know anything of public work in small areas; and it is possible that what is done in the vestry, on a small scale, is developed by the atmosphere of grander surroundings
into grander proportions. The parish reformer can put his finger on one or two officials who are not wanted, but whose salary of a few hundreds seems hardly worth the saving; per-chance the parliamentary reformer might put his finger on unnecessary officials whose salaries amount to thousands. Out of the sums thus gained or saved a great fund could be entrusted to the governing body of London, and the responsibility would then lie with the electors to choose men capable of administering vast wealth, so as to give to all the means of developing their highest possibilities.

Perhaps, though, it is unwise to go into these details and attempt to show how the necessary money may be raised. In England poverty and wealth have met together. It is the fellow-citizens of the poor who see them in East London without joy and without hope. The money which is wasted on fruitless pleasures and fruitless effort would be sufficient to do all, and more than has been suggested in this paper. There is no want of the necessary money, and much is yearly spent—some of it in vain—on efforts, on societies, or on armies, which promise to save the people. When it is clearly seen that wealth may provide some of the means by which their fellow-countrymen may be saved from dreariness and sickness if not from sin, then the difficulty as to the way in which the money may be raised will not long hinder action.

The ways and means of improving the condition of the people are at hand. It is time we gave up the game of party politics and took to real work. It is time we gave up speculation and did what waits the doing. Here are men and women. Are they what they might be? Are they like the Son of man? How can they be helped to reach the standard of their manhood? That is the question of the day; before that of Ireland, Egypt, or the Game Laws. The answer to that question will divide, by other than by party lines, the leaders of men. He who answers it so as to weld old and new together will be the statesman of the future.

Samuel A. Barnett.
THE WORK OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

'If I find... fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes.'—Genesis xviii. 26.

My first thought, as I face you this evening, is of your variety—of your different classes and creeds, of your various communities, and your various views. My second thought is of your common object, of the one longing—the voice of your real selves—which converts variety into unity. You would save the city. Like Abraham, you have seen doom impending; like Buddha, you have seen sights in your daily walk which make the life of ease impossible. You have met poverty, ignorance, and sin.

You have met Poverty. You know families whose weekly income is under the price of a bottle of good wine; men dwarfed in stature, crippled in body, the inmates of a hospital for want of sufficient food; women aged and hardened, broken in spirit because their homes are too narrow for cleanliness or for comfort; children who die because they cannot have the care which preserves the children of the rich.

You have met Ignorance. You know men and women gifted with divine powers, powers of clear sight and deep feeling, you have seen such people taking shallow rhetoric for reason, delighting in exaggeration, clamouring for force as a remedy, adopting swindlers as leaders, making a game—a

1 A sermon preached on Advent Sunday, November 27, 1887, at St. Jude's Church, Whitechapel, before a body of men and women engaged in the work of social reform.
Sunday afternoon’s excitement—of matters which should tear their hearts, killing time which might have been fruitful in thought and joy and love. ‘The future belongs to the man who refuses to take himself seriously,’ says the mocking philosopher. The ignorance which accepts the teaching, and which goes with a light heart to agitate or to repress agitation, is a sight to destroy anyone’s ease of mind.

You have met Sin, the degradation which comes of selfishness. In West London it often hides under fine trappings. Culture covers a multitude of sins. In the exquisitely ordered banquet intemperance and self-indulgence are unnoticed; in the phraseology of the office greed and selfishness pass as political economy; and in the polished talk of books and of society impurity loses its true colour. You, though, are familiar with East London, and here you see sin without its trappings; you know that intemperance—over-eating and over-drinking—means a brutalised nature; you know that greed is cruelty, and that impurity is destructive both of reason and of feeling. You have seen the victims of sin, the drunkard’s home, the gambler’s hell, and the sweater’s shop. You know that the wages of sin is death, and that no culture can give to Mammon any nobility or warm his heart with any spark of unselfish joy.

Poverty, Ignorance, Sin—these threaten the city. Your common longing is to avert its doom. Our fathers nourished a like longing. They hoped in Free Trade, the Suffrage, National Education, and they have been disappointed.

Free Trade has, indeed, greatly increased wealth; the number of the comfortable has been multiplied, but it is a question whether, in the same proportion, the number of the uncomfortable has not also been multiplied. Our England is larger than the England of fifty years ago, but a larger body—like a giraffe’s throat—may only provide a larger space for pain! At any rate, Free Trade, which has given us cheap bread, has not solved the problem of the unemployed.

The extension of the Suffrage, again, for which our fathers strove, has had good results; but the example of later
Parliaments and the growing tendency to legislate by demonstration hardly justified their hopes. Our fathers held that the possession of the suffrage would be effective to destroy Ignorance; they thought that responsibility would develop the seriousness which is necessary to knowledge. They—like other good men who need God’s forgiveness—fed Ignorance with abuse of opponents, with exaggerations, with party cries, they tried to bribe Ignorance to establish its own executioner; but now Ignorance is too much puffed up by flattery, too much enriched by bribes, to yield to the voice which from the register and polling booth says, ‘England expects every man to vote according to his conscience, and then to submit to the common will.’

Lastly, the passing of the Education Act seemed to many to be the beginning of a new age. Schools were rapidly built, money was freely voted, and the children were compelled to attend. The Education Act has not, however, taught the people what is due to themselves or to others. Greed is not eradicated because its form is changed, and, though criminals may be fewer, gambling is as degrading as thieving, and oppression legally exerted over the weak is as cruel as the illegal blow. The children do not leave school with the self-respect born of consciousness of powers of heart and brain and hand, nor with the humanity born of knowledge of others’ burdens. It seems, indeed, as if their chief belief was in the value of competition, and their chief aptitude a skill in satisfying an inspector with the least possible amount of work. At any rate, at the end of twenty years, when a generation has been through the schools, our streets are filled with a mob of careless youths, and our labour market is overstocked with workers whose work is not worth 4d. an hour.

Poverty, Ignorance, and Sin threaten the city. Free Trade, the Suffrage, the Education Act have been tried, and the doom still impends. What is to be done? The principle of true action lies, I think, imbedded in the old Jewish tale. It is not laws and institutions which save a city—it is persons. Institutions are good, just in so far as they are vivified by per-
SOME ACTION: laws are good just in so far as they allow for the free play of person on person. There may be need of reform in institutions and in laws, so as to give to all an open career and equality of opportunity, but it is persons who save; and if today fifty—a company of righteous men could be found in London, the city might be spared and saved.

In support of this position I would offer two considerations. 1. The common mind is now scientific. Professor Huxley, in summing up the results of fifty years of science, claims the creation of a new habit of thought as a greater achievement than any material invention. The common man in the street no longer expects a miracle or worships a theory as men once worshipped the theory of social contract; he asks for a fact. The fact, therefore, that a neighbour is righteous does most to extend righteousness. He who knows a just man is likely to give a fair day's wage and do a fair day's work, to live simply and tell the truth, and it is bad pay and bad work, luxury and lying, which do most to make poverty. He who knows a wise man is likely to search after what is hidden in thought and things, and it is carelessness of what is out of sight which makes ignorance. He who knows a good man is likely to have a passion for honour, for purity, for humanity, and it is the want of higher passion which makes sin.

The righteous man is in a real sense the master of the city. He, as Browning says, who walked about and took account of all thought, said, and acted was 'the town's true master.' Were there in London a company of such righteous men, the power of Poverty, Ignorance, and Sin would be broken.

(2) I am often led to observe that taste is more powerful than interest. People remain on in situations, hold opinions, and adopt habits which are against their interest, because they are more in accordance with their taste. They like the surroundings, they like the life, and liking is an armour which resists the strong lance of the economist.

Now why is it that taste overpowers interest, and that habit
is stronger than law? It is because taste comes through persons and is spread by contact.

The habits or tastes, therefore, which lie at the root of Poverty, Ignorance, and Sin may best be met by the formation of other habits, which come through the example of persons, by the contact of man with man.

Righteous men are therefore necessary—men who would live simply and share their luxury, whose gain would not mean another's loss, who would work for their bread, who would do justice on wrong-doers, show mercy to the weak, and walk humbly before God. The habits of the so-called respectable people, their waste, their idleness, their sensuousness are writ large in the poverty, ignorance, and sin of the disreputable.

Fifty righteous men, rich or poor, setting an example of generosity and honesty, living Christ's life in contact with others might create habits which would take the place of the old bad habits.

The question is sometimes asked, What has been the secret of the success of Christianity? Its basis is not a system but a life. Jesus, the Righteous One, drew to Himself the righteous. They that loved the light came to the light and found the universe instinct with life. Like leaven, the disciples leavened the mass. Christianity, in distinction from other systems, gives no scheme of belief and promises no paradise of plenty—it says instead, 'The kingdom is within you.' 'When you do right you have all that God can give.' 'The joy of Christ's is the highest joy, and His is the joy of the righteous.' Christianity spreads, if it spreads at all, by pointing to a life.

To you, then, desiring to save the city, I take up the lesson as old as Abraham and illumined in Christ. I say, 'Be righteous.'

Follow the light and do the right,
For man can half control his doom
Till you find the deathless angel
Seated in the vacant tomb.
Pensions, too, it may be added, would be no more corrupting to the labourer who works for his country in the workshop than for the civil servant who works for his country at the desk, and the cost of pensions would be no greater than is the cost of infirmaries and almshouses. In one way or another the old and the poor are now kept by those who are richer, and the present method is not a cheap one.

Many men and women fail because they do not know how to work. The workhouses might be made schools of industry. If the ignorant could be detained in workhouses until they had learnt the use of a tool and the pleasure of work, these establishments would become technical schools of the kind most needed, and yearly add a large sum to the wealth of the nation.

Lastly, the whole system of medical relief might be so organised as to provide for every citizen the skill and care necessary for his cure in sickness. As it is, no labourer nor artisan is expected to make such provision, since there are hospitals, infirmaries, and dispensaries to supply his wants. By application or by letter he can gain admission to any of these, and he is expected to be grateful. Medical relief is thus supplied; to organise the relief is merely to take another step along a path already entered, and properly organised the relief need not pauperise. The necessity of begging for a letter, the obligation of humbly waiting at hospital or dispensary doors, the chance that real needs may be unskilfully treated—these are the things which degrade a man. If all the dispensaries, hospitals, and infirmaries were properly ordered, controlled by the State, and open as a matter of right to all comers, it would be possible for every citizen at the dispensary to get the necessary advice and medicine, and thence, if he would, to enter a hospital without any sense of degradation. The national health is the nation's interest, and without additional outlay it could be brought about that every man, woman, and child should have the medical treatment necessary to their condition. The rich would still get sufficient advantage, but it would no longer happen that the lives most useful to the nation would
be left to the care of practitioners who, however kind and devoted, cannot provide either adequate drugs or spare the time for necessary study when for visit and drugs the charge cannot be more than 1s. or 1s. 6d.

By some such development as these suggested, without any break with old traditions, without any fear of pauperising the people, the Poor Law might help to make the life of England healthier and more restful.

In the same way the Education Act might be developed in conjunction with the Church and the Universities to make the life of England wiser and fuller. A complete system of national education ought to take the child from the nursery, pass him through high schools to the University, and then provide him with means to develop the higher life of which all are capable. Some steps have already been made in this direction, but secondary schools or high schools are still needed, and the Church organisation will have to be made popular, so as to represent, not the opinions of a mediæval sect, but the opinions of nineteenth-century Englishmen. Schools in which it would be possible to learn the facts and thoughts new to this age, Churches in which, by ministers in sympathy with their hearers and by the use of forms native of the times, men could be lightened with light upon their souls, would add an untold quantity to the sum of national life.

Alongside of such development much might be done with the Libraries Act and with the powers which local bodies have to keep up parks and gardens. It would be as easy to find in every neighbourhood a site for the people's playground as it is for the workhouse, and all might have, what is now the privilege of the rich, a place for quiet, the sight of green grass and fair flowers. It would be as easy to build a library as an infirmary. In every parish there might be rooms lighted and warmed, where cosy chairs and well-filled shelves might invite the weary man to wander in other times and climes with other mates and minds. In every locality there might be a hall where music, or pictures, or the talk of friends would call into action sleeping powers, and by admiration
devotion to right—all this I can imagine, because it is practicable.

I cannot imagine that which must be reached by new departures and so-called Continental practices. Any scheme, whatever it may promise in the future, which involves revolution in the present is impracticable, and any flirting with it is likely to hinder the progress of reform.

But now there rises the obvious objection, 'All this will cost much money;' 'Free education means 1d. in the pound; libraries and museums mean 2d.;' 'The suggested changes would absorb more than 1s.; the ratepayers could not stand it.'

I agree; the present ratepayers could not pay heavier rates. There must be other means of raising the money. Some scheme for further graduated taxing is possible; while the wealth locked up in the endowed charities, the increase which would be brought to the revenue by a new assessment of the land-tax, and the sum which might be saved by abolishing sinecures and waste in every public office would meet a great part of this need.

The wealth of the endowed charities has never been realised, and if that amount be not reduced in paying for elementary education, it might do much to make life happier. If men saw to what uses this money could be put, they would not be so ready to back up an agitation raised on the School Board to get hold of this money for School Board work. They would say, 'No; the schools are safe; in some way they must be provided and paid for. We won't shield the Board from attacks of ratepayers by giving them our money to spend; we want that for things which the Board cannot provide.'

There is also a vast sum which might be got by a new assessment—which in some cases would be a re-imposition—of the land-tax, and by a closer scrutiny into the ways of public offices. The land-tax returns the same amount as it returned more than two hundred years ago, while rents have gone on increasing. The abuses of sinecures and of useless officials are patent to all who know anything of public work in small areas; and it is possible that what is done in the vestry, on a small scale, is developed by the atmosphere of grander surroundings
The watchword of its reform must be 'Thorough.' The thing attempted must be thoroughly done.

THE ABLE-BODIED POOR

What does the Poor Law attempt to do for the poor workman or workwoman? It attempts to secure that no one in England shall starve, it therefore provides relief for every one who is destitute, and as experience has shown that the offer of relief induces idleness, it adds a spur for the idle. It provides relief by (1) weekly doles through the hands of the relieving officers; by (2) in-door residence in the workhouse; and by (3) nightly lodging in casual wards. It adds a spur by making the relief in the workhouse and the casual ward as disagreeable as possible.

Its failure to relieve the poor and to stimulate the idle is notorious. Its weekly dole, or 'out-relief,' administered by a relieving officer bound to suspect every assertion, brings out the greed of the applicant, destroys his self-respect, checks his energies, and has had a distinct effect in keeping down wages. Its in-door treatment sends out every poor man embittered by the contempt he has experienced, and in no way strengthened, either in body or mind, to fight the battle of life. The prison discipline, enforced by officials unskilled in discipline, the degrading tasks at oakum-picking or stone-breaking, the foul talk of Sundays and recreation hours when noise and evil get their way unchecked, the niggardly given portions of food, unite to make the workhouses unfit to bring out the good or check the bad in human nature. The unfortunate despair under such treatment, the idle set it at defiance. The visitor, as he walks through the labour sheds or casual wards, notes only hard set faces and lowering glances, he finds it impossible to get an answering smile or even a look to show consciousness of common humanity. And, then, the sting of the soul lies in the thought that the law creates the class. The people are low, ignorant, and brutal, but they are made anti-human by suspicious, unloving, and inconsiderate relief.

The Poor Law system of relief is demoralising, and it does
THE WORK OF RIGHTEOUSNESS ¹

'If I find ... fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all ... the place for their sakes.'—Genesis xviii. 26.

My first thought, as I face you this evening, is of your variety—of your different classes and creeds, of your various communities, and your various views. My second thought is of your common object, of the one longing—the voice of your real selves—which converts variety into unity. You would save the city. Like Abraham, you have seen doom impending; like Buddha, you have seen sights in your daily walk which make the life of ease impossible. You have met poverty, ignorance, and sin.

You have met Poverty. You know families whose weekly income is under the price of a bottle of good wine; men dwarfed in stature, crippled in body, the inmates of a hospital for want of sufficient food; women aged and hardened, broken in spirit because their homes are too narrow for cleanliness or for comfort; children who die because they cannot have the care which preserves the children of the rich.

You have met Ignorance. You know men and women gifted with divine powers, powers of clear sight and deep feeling, you have seen such people taking shallow rhetoric for reason, delighting in exaggeration, clamouring for force as a remedy, adopting swindlers as leaders, making a game—a

¹ A sermon preached on Advent Sunday, November 27, 1887, at St. Jude's Church, Whitechapel, before a body of men and women engaged in the work of social reform.
then be met with the distinct offer: 'Will you submit to training for six or twelve months, during which time your home shall be kept together and you yourself fitted to earn a living in a shop or on the land?' They who accept the offer will at once be put to work. Some will be sent to the farm colony to be taught to dig and do rough field labour, to take new strength into their bodies, and be fitted for agricultural employment at home or abroad; others will be put to tailoring, to wood or iron work in the workhouse, and be sent out at the end of their time with the self-reliance which comes to those who have a trade in their hands. They who refuse the offer, as well as they who abuse the offer, will be sent to the house of correction. There to be kept at hard labour for such time as may seem good.

By this plan, the unfortunate would be automatically sifted out from the idle, and have within their reach a means by which they might honourably regain a place in the ranks of workers. The means are such as long experience proves to be most likely to be efficient. The unfortunate—by which is meant the poor who are poor by other than their own fault—are either weak or ignorant: weak by inherited tendencies or by unhealthy living; ignorant by absence of training in skill or of application to an industry. Among the thousands of able-bodied who apply for relief, it is rare to find any skilled mechanic, or indeed anyone who has a trade in his hands. It seems as if the possession of a trade lifted its owner into another society for which relief systems and workhouses are unnecessary. The community, with its free education and its technical schools, has attempted to put a trade within the reach of all, but somehow it fails, and either because the schools aim to fill and not to train the mind, or because society and parents are greedy of child-labour, the towns swarm with men and women fit only 'to turn a wheel.'

There is nothing, therefore, which the community can more rightly or wisely do than give to these neglected members the opportunity of learning. In one sense, the gift is payment of a debt, a part of the education originally offered; in another
sense, it is an insurance against a greater claim, a means of
relief to prevent the ultimate poverty of the whole family.

Other means of relief are vain; money given during slack
times, or assistance to increase wages, are remedies worse than
the disease. The only way to deal with poverty is to put into
the poor man's hands the weapons proved to be effective against
poverty. Those weapons are health and skill. Let then the
Poor Law put these within the reach of everyone whose good
intention is proved by his willingness to submit to training.

It is not the least merit of the proposed plan that it will
bring home to the idlers helpful punishment. At present
there is little doubt but that the mass of those ragged,
wretched human beings who throng relief offices and hang
about street corners, is made up of drunkards and idlers.
There is little doubt also, but that these unhappy people are
supported by the sentiment which provides breakfasts, shelters,
and casual doles. The sentiment under the circumstances
need not be condemned.

The thought that the beggar shivering in his rags may
perchance be worthy and unfortunate, and that for him there
is no place of refuge other than the hope-killing workhouse
or casual ward, is not to be endured by a brother man, so the
shelter is opened and the dole is given. Vain is it for the
police and the missionaries to warn the public that such
giving encourages a wretched life and makes rags a means
of livelihood; common humanity will not be content without
an assurance of hope for the lowest of its kind. If, therefore,
it were known that the offer of training in honest work were
open to everyone willing to submit to kindly discipline, there
would be no longer the same disposition to give the dole,
and one means to which idlers trust would be removed.

At last the educator and the idler would be face to face,
at last the law and the law-breaker would meet together.
Too long the idlers, the lazy who refuse to be punctual or
regular, the dissolute who riot in the low lodging-houses, the
blacklegs who sneak into other men's work, have preyed on
society. They have reaped what has been sown for others,
as the manner in which they are conducted. They have commenced under the true spirit of the Poor Law, and are now growing in a better form. The system has been a great deal founded on the principles of the Poor Law, but if the same system were applied to other countries, the result would be disastrous. The experience of the Poor Law is that where the work is not paid, the poor may starve. The system is one of necessity. It has been no more than an attempt to meet the main difficulty. They have been urged to work, and the payment of wages has been the inducement.

The system is not correct, and no attempt is made for its continued work. The idea is that work and give to him who is able to work. The effect of a few months of training, and a few months of work may be very different, with more or less receiving remunerative treatment. These institutions should be attempted by being voluntary, and every man will have to submit to the necessity of seeking work, and the performance of work. In respect of the training-school houses of correction must be established, a system must be stern to keep, for periods of six months. Those who refuse or abuse training in these houses of correction the discipline will be severe; but where the processes of education will not be neglected, and the work done will be remunerative.

By such means the Poor Law might provide for the poor the help best fitted to enable them to rise above poverty, applying at the same time a spur to the idle. The field left open for charitable agencies is still large, and the work well defined.
POOR LAW REFORM

In the first place, there will be in the workhouses and houses of correction a call for that personal service which, discovering by friendship the strength and weakness of character, will supply what is lacking.

Men and women will be able by books, by visits, and by talk, to give assurance to all who are for the moment isolated that they are still members of the great human society, and they will be able to give that individual education without which the best systems must fail.

There will also be a call for money to start those who have been trained either at home or abroad, some of whom will be fit to be put on the land, some to be equipped with tools. The money now spent on shelter, food, and casual doles, rises to a mighty sum; but even this sum would be absorbed if those who had proved themselves worthy received adequate help. The present system, or want of system, has lowered the standard of what seems necessary to life.

In the effort to relieve all, the charitable have been content to provide food insufficient to support the body and accommodation destructive of self-respect. How else could a well-fed man offer his starving brother a halfpenny dinner to satisfy his craving, or a dirty leather bed in a crowded room for his night’s rest. A system which would leave to the care of the charitable only a limited number of families might, it may be hoped, evoke a charity which would show consideration for human needs, and generously give what is necessary for decency and health.

THE AGED POOR

What now, it may be asked, has the Poor Law attempted to do for the old? The answer is given in the figures set out by Mr. Charles Booth. It has provided relief for 80 per cent., or for a number nearly approaching that figure, of all persons over sixty-five in England and Wales. Rather, it should be said, that it has attempted to provide such relief.

The 87,603 who receive the relief in-doors are not happy, and they have not deserved punishment. The majority are
women. They have probably spent themselves at dull and ill-paid work, they have borne children and learnt fully the lesson of sorrow; they would have enjoyed in their old age to have their children about their knees, to have wandered quietly in the haunts of their youth, and lived again in the talk of the young. The old in the workhouses, wearied by the monotonous cleanliness, provoked to selfishness by the atmosphere of officialism, made pettish and petty by one another's complaints, afford a sad sight. England must indeed be rich in teachers if she can thus waste those whom God sends to teach reverence and gentleness.

The 420,057 who receive out-relief are not in the real sense relieved. They have had to go hat in hand to the relieving officer. They have had to submit to his questions, and at last have received what must be grudgingly given. They live, indeed, amid old haunts and with young friends; but they live as paupers, conscious of a barrier between themselves and their independent neighbours. They may not show signs of the wound their nature bears, but an experience I had in Winnipeg showed me how deeply human nature feels severance from its kind.

A Whitechapel woman was there living with her husband in a house not better than a Whitechapel house. Their circumstances were poor enough, and the trade of tinker did not seem to be well paid. But 'tell them at home,' they said, 'that not for 100l. would the old tinker return; here our children go to school with the best, and we get respect.'

The recipients of out-relief are paupers; they form a class apart; they are counted up with drunkards and idlers, and they can never feel that they have that respect which transfigured life in Winnipeg. They who might have brought sweetness and content into the home bring too often grumbling, and are the parents of the pauper spirit.

The Poor Law therefore which gives relief to such a large proportion of the old people of this country does not do thoroughly what it attempts to do. It has removed the stimulus to effort; it has lowered the rate of wages; it has
taken old age under its care, and it has made old age anxious
and sad.

The proposals for reform are general. 'Let there be,' say
some, 'carefully discriminated out-relief and classified in-
firmaries, so that they who are most deserving may have
all that they can desire.' But who is to be the judge of
character; who is to say that A. shall have out-relief and B. go
into the infirmary, that C. is to be treated as if he were an
honoured guest, and D. as if he were a criminal? It may be
that B. has fought temptations, and had trials which have
never come near to A., and that D. has done kindnesses and
helped others, as C. never dreamed of doing.

There is no way in which strangers can judge character; the
good and the evil must be let grow together; and he who at-
ttempts to separate them will destroy the good with the evil.

Beyond this there is something humiliating, a loss of
self-respect, which is entailed in submitting to such judg-
ment. The secrets and sorrows of a man's life are his own;
his efforts to save, his charities to children or to friends, his
afflictions, the sins of his youth, are not for public use, and
he who is called on to expose them suffers irreparably in
character. There is a necessary modesty for the character as
there is for the person.

It is not, therefore, by lavish out-relief or by infirmaries,
although they be pleasant as almshouses, that the needs of
old age are to be met.

The more popular proposals are that pensions be provided,
and three schemes have been suggested.

There is (1) that by which young people are to be comp-
pelled to save and employers compelled to contribute. This
may at once be put aside as impracticable. There are classes
—wayward youths, factory girls, farm labourers—whom it
would be impossible to compel, and there are many workmen
and workwomen, costermongers and charwomen, who have no
employers. The scheme would moreover entail an army of
officials and a system of registration most distasteful to public
sentiment.
There is a scheme by which savings are to be supplemented, so that any man who has saved 5l. shall receive a pension of 5s. a week at sixty-five. The objection to this scheme is that it would be of only partial use. There are many labourers, both male and female, who can save nothing beyond what is necessary for times of ill-health and trade depression, and the community would still be left face to face with a body of sick and poor people for whom its previous action by means of the Poor Law had made it responsible. An incidental objection to this scheme is that it would bring about interference with Friendly Societies and other independent saving agencies.

There remains the scheme by which the State gives to every citizen above sixty-five the sum of 5s. a week. Mr. Charles Booth has given this scheme the honour of his examination in a paper read before the Statistical Society. He shows how the annual cost, 17,000,000l., would fall most heavily on the wealthier classes, while the working classes would receive back about four times the amount they would pay in extra taxes. He shows further that, as in effect the money would be taken from one national pocket and put into another, there would be no prejudicial result on wages, on energy, or on self-respect.

The objections generally urged against the plan are (a) that it would paralyse thrift. In reply it may be said that it is hope which induces saving, and that the thriftlessness of the very poor is induced by the thought, ‘What is the good if, by denying myself every luxury, by giving up smoking and drinking, I do secure the usual superannuation allowance, 5s. a week at the age of sixty-five, it won’t keep me.’

The very poor have no hope, and are therefore extravagant. On the other hand, the man who has got a nest egg, the tradesman who has enough for old age, the workman who has joined one club, are all keen to get more. It is notorious that workmen become members of many friendly societies, and that in tradesmen the habit of thrift is so developed as to become destructive of habits which are nobler.
It is further urged (b) that a 5s. pension is inadequate. To which it may be answered that in the experience of the Tower Hamlets Pension Society, it has been found to be adequate, and Mr. Booth has shown the inexpediency of a larger pension. There are very few who have not so saved money or so made friends as to be able to meet 5s. with 3s. They who have neither saved nor made friends will probably prefer life in the workhouse.

A further objection is (c) that many who received the pension, being thriftless and undisciplined, would simply abuse this accession of wealth. The answer to which is, that if they so abused the pension as to be unable to live decently, they would be driven into the workhouse.

But, according to the principle of Poor Law reform which I have suggested, the question is—Will the adoption of this universal pension scheme enable the State to discharge the obligation to the old which it has undertaken? Will it reach all the old and make possible for them honourable, peaceful, and self-respecting life? Obviously the answer is 'Yes.'

A pension will reach every one who has spent his days in England by a rule as regular and by means as dignified as a pension now reaches a Cabinet Minister. It will not depend on the judgment or favour of any official, and as it comes alike to the highest noble and to the lowest commoner, it will involve in neither the least loss of self-respect. If now it be asked, What then will be left for voluntary effort? In the first place, it may be answered that voluntary effort has been able to do little for old age. The Friendly Societies have made no adequate provision, and the pension schemes in connection with the Hearts of Oak and the Oddfellows have been used by the merest fraction of their members. Charity is hardly enlisted, and in three East End parishes where out-relief has been abolished it has proved to be vain, by continual appeals to the whole of London, to get the small necessary sum for the annual pensions of 100 persons. But a further answer is, that if 5s. a week be allowed to every one over sixty-five, there will be much more needed in many cases to make old
receive relief there is no means of estimating, but obviously some hundreds of thousands must annually receive gratuitous medical help.

The relief thus given has destroyed any chance for the development of self-help, and in no poor man's budget is adequate allowance made for the payment of skilled medical attendance. That a doctor will be provided is accepted as certain, and not even the high class artisan, who has secured by club payments medical care for himself, thinks it necessary to secure a wage large enough to enable him to get the same medical care for other members of his family. The service of the dispensary or hospital is counted on. At the same time, the abundant relief which is given does not meet the necessities of the case. There are many workmen who die, and more who are rendered incapable, for the want of the skill which enables rich men to rise well from their sick beds. The busy doctor who is paid 4s. a year for each member of the club, and 1s. 6d. a visit for other patients, has to work so hard for a living that he cannot find time to study. It is a sad and common experience of those who have friends among the poor that many die who might by skill and nursing have been saved.

There are indeed skilled doctors, the highest in their profession, who, at the hospitals or dispensaries, offer free advice. But to get this advice, there is the necessity of 'begging' a letter, or there are the long hours in the waiting-room, where the sick folk are herded, and then there is an interview which probably is only of a few seconds' duration. The hospitals for those who are able to get admission offer everything which is wanted; and the universal testimony of the patients, at any rate in London hospitals, is praise of the doctors, praise of the nurses, and praise of the management. But admission is, after all, a chance. The hospitals are not arranged in neighbourhoods for the convenience of the poor, and sometimes favour fills the beds with friends, or with 'interesting cases,' who are not in such need as the sick man who is refused.
The Poor Law dispensary and infirmary are thus often the one resort of the sick, and then on the condition that the sick become paupers. It is vain to pass an Act of Parliament that recipients of medical relief shall not be paupers. As long as relief comes by an application to the relieving officer, as long as the applicant has to expose his circumstances, and as long as he feels the condescension of those who give, he cannot retain his self-respect. He suffers, at any rate, the pain and loss of pauperism.

What, therefore, the Poor Law attempts to do, is not done. The poor are not adequately relieved in sickness. They are driven from institution to institution, they linger to death in their own rooms, or they sacrifice, what some value even more than health, their self-respect, and apply to the Poor Law.

The obvious reform is to remove the intervention of the relieving officer.

Let it be everyone's right to get advice from the parish doctor, medicine from the parish dispensary, treatment in the parish infirmary, fever hospital, or lunatic asylum. A parson and a church are provided for the spiritual needs of the parish, and every one has a right to the parson's ministrations and the church's service; a doctor and an infirmary might be as freely provided for the material needs of the parish. The workman, counting on the provision of medical care, would not then, as he now does, count without his host. He, his wife, or his child, would have the right to apply in sickness to his own parish doctor; he would neither have to humble himself to beg, nor need he feel any sense of obligation for a favour. He would get from the doctor advice or, if necessary, an order for admission to the infirmary or hospital, according to his need. In the case of a patient being unfit to be moved, the doctor would order for the home all necessary comforts and nourishment.

The Poor Law would thus do well its own part in making provision for the sick. What would be left for the voluntary bodies?

Perhaps the example of the Poor Law might en-
courage the authorities also to undertake one duty and do it well. Many are at present inadequately attempted. The arrangements, for instance, for giving country change for convalescents are of uncertain application. General hospitals and special hospitals compete with one another, and the care which has been found necessary for the eyes and teeth of the rich is not brought within reach of the ordinary working-man. If the Poor Law did offer to all people means of medical relief in ordinary cases of sickness, voluntary bodies could add the luxuries of nursing and change of air, or for special cases the special skill of a special hospital.

There is little doubt but that the reform of the Poor Law medical relief would be followed by the reform of the chaos into which the voluntary charitable medical relief has fallen.

THE CHILDREN

The Poor Law, when it is well administered, does perhaps all which any system can do for the well-being of children. It provides schools equal to any provided by charitable societies, it has introduced cottage homes, and no expense is spared to remove all suggestion of pauper or institution life. It has training homes for girls and training ships for boys, and it boards out in country villages the orphan and deserted children. Into these schools are freely received the children of widows and the disabled, the Guardians taking especial pains to keep all concerned clear of pauper contagion.

The education of children in institutions can never be satisfactory; but it is hard to say what improvement in Poor Law schools could be effected by any change of law. As public opinion becomes more intelligent the Government or Guardians will become also more intelligent, and as Christian devotion becomes bold enough to leave the shelter of its own homes and orphanages, the officials may oftener be those of a Christian spirit. It is on the increase of knowledge and of good-will rather than on law reform that the better welfare of the children depends.
CONCLUSION

Poor Law reform is a vast subject, and one not easily to be taken apart from other reforms. The public mind, however, has been stirred, and requires that something shall be done. It ill endures the knowledge that the people starve, live degraded lives, and die for want of doctor's care. It has, on occasion after occasion, poured its money into the laps of philanthropists who have promised great things, and now that the great things have not come, the demand is made that the Poor Law remove the cause of shame.

The danger of the moment is a reform directed by sentiment apart from knowledge. During the past fifty years Poor Law administrators have accumulated experience of the greatest value, and it would be disastrous if, out of goodwill to the poor, the reformers were to introduce methods proved to be hurtful. Chief among such methods stand out-relief and doles of labour. Again and again they have brought misery into families, and reduced the resources of living. It would be disastrous if, in a hurry to get rid of poverty, the Guardians were encouraged to give liberal out-relief to the unemployed, or to find them work in municipal workshops. Then, indeed, would it seem as if history were written in vain, and as if generations of the poor suffered in vain.

If any experienced administrator of relief were asked what he most desired, he would, I suppose, answer, 'To capture the loafer.' The loafer preys on charity, robs the workman of his work, and corrupts youth. At present, he escapes the best devised system and the most shrewd relieving officers. He is sheltered by the charitable public, which provides him with food, and insists on believing that he may be unfortunate, neglected, or injured.

The aim of Poor Law reform should be to get hold of the loafer, to take him out from among the poor, and to confine him until he had learnt some habits of punctuality and of
work. It is impossible to do this until charitable public
opinion is satisfied that provision is made for every one who
needs, that the old man who sweeps the crossing and shivers
out his petition has an adequate pension, and might be at
home, and that the unemployed who have no work to do, the
cadgers who attend cabs, the ragged creatures who sleep by
the arches, might be learning a trade and living in decency.

The simple principle of Poor Law reform is 'thoroughness.'
It must do thoroughly what it has already undertaken, and
not extend its operations. As it has undertaken the care of
the old and sick, let its care be thorough; as it has undertaken
to provide for the unskilled, let it do so thoroughly by making
them efficient workers. At last the public which now protects
the loafer will be induced to leave him alone, and he, driven
by his needs, will accept the correction which will make him
industrious.

Samuel A. Barnett.
THE POOR LAW AS A CHARITABLE AGENCY

'Can any charity come out of a Board of Guardians?' is a question likely to rouse as much scorn as a parallel question about Nazareth. Guardians have never escaped the reproaches levelled at them in 'Oliver Twist.' Public opinion condemns them as the hard and official protectors of 'Bumble,' and by Mr. Booth's preachers the Poor Law is often made matter for scorn.

The report of the Whitechapel Guardians just published makes therefore strange reading. Its table of contents shows that the Guardians, in addition to their ordinary administration of the infirmary and workhouse, deal with rescue work, children's country holidays, emigration, foreign immigration, protection of children, and winter distress. It will be seen that their work is such as cannot be left out of consideration in any scheme for helping the poor, and it raises the question whether the Poor Law must not be the foundation on which any such scheme is based.

With regard, for example, to rescue work, there is no shelter in London so large as that afforded by the workhouse. It is here that women come when the shelters raised by some wave of passing emotion fail. It is here at some period or other of their lives that the greater number of the poor fallen men and women seek refuge. On this subject the Guardians say: 'Those who best know the East End of London, best know how patiently and successfully the organised work of

1 Reprinted, by permission, from Macmillan's Magazine, 1893.
THE POOR LAW AS A CHARITABLE AGENCY

social rescue has been through long years carried on, and how unjust it would be now to measure its results by the extent to which they are publicly paraded, or to assume that the degraded and miserable are submerged and uncared for."

In this connection it may be stated that in the Whitechapel Workhouse, the efforts of the matron alone during the past year have resulted in placing upon their feet, and introducing into respectable service, forty-three female paupers. This fact needs no comment, while it is to be observed that it is additional to the 'excellent work carried on by the lady visitors.'

This fact which needs no comment, and the other fact as to the co-operation of the lady visitors, show that there is a steady direction of friendly effort against the inroads of vice. No agency in this field can claim great success. It seems as if it needed all the love and all the time of one woman to raise one other woman. No system is successful, and many systems absorb much thought and money merely to keep them going. The Guardians have rooms, agents, nurses, and doctors; they have a machinery which is always in order and always at work. Alongside of this machinery they have the service of devoted women who visit the wards, make friends of the women, and send them out to work with the memory of a love which is both strong and kind.

Vice is vice, and that pity which has in it no element of indignation will not really touch the wrong doer. A weak spot in much of the rescue work is its tendency to substitute pity for mercy, and to treat the sinner so as to make her minimise her sin. They who thus work may attract large numbers to their shelters: they do catch sometimes the feebler natures; but they alienate the stronger, who want sympathy in their own self-condemnation as much as they want it in their aspirations after a better life. The Guardians, who offer on the one hand the discipline of the House, and on the other the service of a friend, have a charity which is more like His who on occasions could be angry, and who sternly taught that for every idle word an account would be required.

Children's country holidays is almost the latest pet object
of the charitable. They raise funds called after their own names, and do what one another in their efforts to give
poor children a sounder start.

The guardians have not lagged behind in this forward movement. All have sent a party of children from their
schools to show influence in the homes of cottagers living in
the open country. In their necessarily formal language they
seek to impress mental and moral advantage to be
derived from the cottage's ways; but it is easy to imagine
something a vast lot behind that language. How the child,
with its impertinent curiosity and clear, sinless eyes, the great district
among a family that has never revealed itself in the freedom of
cottage life. How interesting must have been the ways of the
family, how awakening the varied sights, how the mind and
heart must have responded to new calls. How many memories
must have been left to influence in after years the choice for
a country life or against it known? The Guardians who
give this physical, mental and moral advantage, are certainly
not to be marked in a list of charitable agencies.

Immigration is another aspect undertaken by rival societies
which in the report receives good and reasonable notice. In
a short paragraph it is stated that with the consent of the
High Commissioner such and such persons have been settled
in Canada, and reports follow showing that previous emigrants
are doing well. The charity of the act is as the charity of the
rival societies. Miss A. and Mr. B., who advertise their work
and collect large subscriptions, have done no more than the
Guardians of Walleschapel have done; but it is questionable
if any of the voluntary societies could give so adequate and
complete a record of each individual emigrated.

There is an obvious danger in this sort of charity. It is so
easy to take the unknown for the successful, and to think that
because the poor are out of sight, they are therefore out of
need. The sanguine and impatient temper of the philanthropist is hardly to be trusted in a matter where results are
so far out of reach, and his supporters are too glad to hear of
success to make any inquiries. The calm and official notice
of the Guardians may therefore be even a better guarantee of
the charity which considereth the poor than the warm and
glowing generalities of charitable agencies. Service 'with a
quiet mind' is the service wanted in those who serve the poor.

Foreign immigration is a matter which is now rousing
heated feeling. In the name of charity it has been urged that
'This is the agency which reduces the price of labour below
its fair level, which renders effective combination among the
sweated classes impossible, and which drives many English-
men from their own country to seek a livelihood in some
distant land, so that while foreign paupers are landing every
day on these shores, Englishmen are being forced out to make
room for them.' And in the name of the same charity the
feelings of the poor have been roused against the foreigner,
whose habits are different and whose poverty absorbs benevo-

lence.

Sometimes it is almost made to seem as if the one
thing necessary to raise the poor of East London was the
exclusion of the foreigner. The Whitechapel Guardians have
gone into the matter and, in the spirit of the Scientific
Charity inaugurated by Mr. Charles Booth, have looked at
facts. It has been found that three-fourths of the Jews in
England are in London, and two-thirds of this number in
Whitechapel, and that in Whitechapel only 18 per cent.
of the population are aliens. Further, it has been found that
of the 788 in-door paupers only eight are tailors, nineteen
shoemakers, and four cabinet-makers—the trades chiefly
affected by alien immigrants. 'The statistics,' says the
Report, 'of pauperism within the Whitechapel Union do not
enable us to affirm with any positiveness that the burdens of
the ratepayers have to any material extent been increased by
the incursion of foreign poor into the district.'

Here are two voices. The voice of Charity calls us to shut
out the naked and the hungry and the stranger; it makes his
destitution a charge, and works on the selfishness of his fellow-
workmen to oppress him still further. The voice of Officialism
says, 'The poor foreigner is not the plague you think him to
be: he does not steal as you think he steals; he is at any rate a man, and he can be raised. Go on calmly. Deal with him as with your own fellow-citizens, and raise his standard of living." Surely there is some confusion in these voices, and it is Charity which speaks in the name of Officialism.

One of the saddest of modern revelations is the cruelty which children endure at the hands of their parents. It is a national disgrace that it should be necessary to found a National Society for Preventing Cruelty to Children. Under the banner of that society, ardent men and women have been enlisted, and as yet their zeal seems to have given few signs of flagging or of extravagance.

The Guardians by their works deserve also to be enrolled among the protectors of children. They have done the duty effectively. A recent Act of Parliament gives them power to adopt a child deserted by its parents and to keep it, if a boy, until the age of sixteen, and if a girl, until the age of eighteen. The Whitechapel Guardians have during the year used the power so as to take twenty-seven children under their care. These twenty-seven children, drawn from the common lodging-houses and furnished rooms which are the disgrace of a small area in the Whitechapel Union, may be boarded out in country cottages, where, under the care of some motherly woman, they will be trained in loving and in enjoying.

The process in its first stages is so protected that there can be no abuses either through the over-eagerness of the charitable or the changeableness of the poor. There can be no writs of Habeas Corpus to put an end to good work or to shake men's faith in the honest intentions of the philanthropist. In its latter stages the supervision is no less sustained and careful. The adopted child will not, because its first friends are too busy or have died, become a slave-servant, or be allowed to begin life unfriended. The Guardians have a machinery which reaches far, and having put a heart into the machine they are able to do effectively that which charity tries and often fails to do.

The winter distress brought into operation a new army of
helpers. The tale of their campaign has been written in glowing language, and the world which has heard the tale has been at once shocked by the evidence of distress and comforted by the thought that at least something has been done. Whitechapel has naturally been ground chosen for the operations of the army of helpers. Its reputation, the presence in its midst of so many who are wretched and destitute, has led to the establishment of many shelters, workshops, and mission rooms. Within the radius of one quarter of a mile there are, it is said, no less than fifty centres of charitable work.

Among the resources available for dealing with winter distress the Guardians are rarely counted, but this report shows that they are not only familiar with the condition of the district, but also that they have thoughtfully dealt with its distress. They tell how, addressing the District Board of Works, they expressed readiness to co-operate in the direction of 'Recommending for employment those who from their previous circumstances and conditions it is most desirable should not be placed under the necessity of receiving relief at the cost of the rates. At the same time, the Guardians disavowed any desire or intention to ask the District Board to do more than aid them in dealing with the front rank of resident heads of families of good character, whose homes are worth preserving, and, therefore, the conditions precedent to a recommendation to the District Board would be an honest, industrious character, a willingness to work, a bona fide residence in the district of at least six months, and the possession of a decent home.'

The language is not the language of charitable reports; but those who recognise that the best relief is that which considers the poor and respects the desire to work rather than to beg—a desire which is not dead in anyone—will acknowledge that the methods of the Guardians are inspired by the spirit of true charity.

This inquiry into circumstances, this steady offer of help to those who themselves have made an effort, has been going on
regularly; and the Guardians, like the Cardinal in Browning's play, reflecting on the various spasmodic attempts to suddenly right what is wrong, may say, 'We have known four-and-twenty leaders of revolt.' Probably, if the Cardinal and they could speak their minds, they would say that it is these 'revolts,' these sudden attempts by means of Mansion House Funds, Salvation Army schemes, and rival charities, which hinder the operation of methods founded on knowledge and carried out with regularity.

At the same time, as may be gathered from the tables and statistics at the end of the report, the Guardians welcome the co-operation of charitable workers. One table tells how 245 families have been assisted by ways and means not at the disposal of the Guardians. Many have received grants of money, large or small, with which to buy tools or get clear of debt; many have received pensions, many have been found situations. Another table tells how the service of ladies has been enlisted to befriend girls who have been placed out in the world. A few dry figures and a few short sentences tell the history of thirty-five girls under twenty years of age. Those who know the facts know how much lies behind these short sentences, the many visits and the hearty sympathy which enables, for instance, the lady who visited J. S. to say she 'has been nearly four years in this her first place and doing very well—is stronger than she was, but still requires much care.'

If in many cases the ladies' report is sad, while the first thought of the reader must be, 'How refreshing to get truthfulness,' the second must be a reflection on the system of big schools which, costing the Guardians about thirteen shillings a week for each child, sends out thirty-five girls, of whom only four can be said to be doing 'very satisfactorily' and only eleven 'satisfactorily.' Large charity schools give other returns of their own work, but their returns have not to be submitted to the impartial scrutiny of officials.

The Whitechapel Guardians do not in the present report dwell at length upon what they have done and are doing in the ordinary administration of the Poor Law Relief. It is
only between the lines that it can be read how they have practically abolished out-relief, substituting for the necessarily hard hand of the relieving officer, the soft touch of the charitable visitor; how they have made the infirmary a rival to the hospital by efficient nursing and pleasant surroundings, and how the workhouse is in fact an industrial school wherein a man or woman may, if they will, learn what is useful.

At the same time the language of the report is such that no one reading it will think that all is done that is possible. Their work is in the Guardians' estimation far from perfect. Some changes are wanted in the law. Their buildings being old-fashioned require constant alteration, and for want of adequate support their efforts have somewhat the nature of experiments. In almost every paragraph it is possible to read an appeal for help directed to those whose will to help the poor is strong enough to endure control.

The union of voluntary and official charity is the striking feature in the system of the Whitechapel Guardians. In this union there seems to be equal gain to each. It is a marriage in which each supplies what the other lacks. Voluntary charity gains 'back-bone,' it becomes strong and regular. Official charity gains delicacy of touch, the power of adapting itself to individual needs.

If the union were complete, if all the force of voluntary charity now thrown into Whitechapel were brought into union with the official charity of the Guardians, it is possible that the dreams of some reformers would be realised. Then it might be that relief would go to those whom relief would help, and punishment to those whom punishment would help. Then it might be that those who are helped and those who are punished would alike feel the friendship of a fellow-man or a fellow-woman willing to share their sorrow and their hope. Then it might be that the workhouse would cease to be a degradation, and be deterrent only by being educational. The report of the Whitechapel Guardians shows that the official administration is strong, and that it is willing to accept the co-operation of voluntary charity. Other reports
show that voluntary charity is also strong. With whom does it lie to make the union between them complete?

A Board of Guardians has admitted people of good will into its counsels, it has adopted a policy framed in consideration for the needs of the poor, and it has welcomed the help of those who love the poor. If charity will submit to be restrained by experience, to surrender will-worship and to work within limits; if charity will be regular and give up short cuts to large ends; if charity will be content to drop its party watchwords and work under a common flag, then it may be that help which is both human and strong will be brought to raise the poor.

Samuel A. Barnett.
HUMAN SERVICE

Luke xxii. 27.—For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.

One of the signs of the time is a new consciousness of others' needs. All parties assume that there are Rights which have not been recognised, and Duties which have not been done. The poor and weak are in need, and Christ's followers are among them as those who would serve. The desire to serve is forcing men to new, and sometimes to strange, activities; it exists in all and waits for expression.

As I look at you I feel, as it were, breaking against my mind thoughts you have never uttered, longings you have hidden, 'the beatings of that passionate humanity' which underlie the calm surface of Oxford manners. The various hopes, the indistinct ideals which lead you to care for others' needs wait for some voice to give them expression.

I can imagine how, as you ask of the Force which holds you, 'What is thy name?' some voice might put into clear language the method and the end of the nineteenth century revolution.

Busy with our trade and surrounded with the signs of wealth, we, like Jacob, have been met by the angel of our forgotten brother. It is in the struggle with this angel, in the effort to find what we must do for others' needs, that we shall get the knowledge which will change our characters and make us princes with God.

1 A sermon preached before the University of Oxford on June 16 1884.
Where two or three are gathered, there Christ is. Where two talk earnestly, as did they who walked to Emmaus, of the 'things which have happened,' and commune together of all their meaning, a third is always present, though their eyes be holden. The third is the ideal of the age, the Christ that is to be.

I can imagine how the ideal of this age might be declared, how the one purpose to which all things move might be shown, how human life might be transfigured, and the future made manifest as the image of Christ, full of knowledge and of love. Among us as we sit at ease and count them great who are served, is, once more, the figure of One that serveth. When we acknowledge Him to be our Master, and follow Him, then we shall eat and drink at the table of peace and sit on thrones of knowledge.

I can imagine a sermon which would give life to this consciousness of others' needs, which would lend a voice to the angel which has checked us in our course of progress, and give a form to the ideal. I can imagine how, hearing such a sermon, you might leave this church with a new sense of the glory of your calling to be here as those who serve, and of the majesty of your own selves as fellow-servants with the highest.

Such power of thought or of speech is not mine. I cannot touch the manifold efforts of modern care for others' needs; the passionate stroke of the reformer, the gentle touch of the comforter, and show the unity of their variety. I cannot light up the men in the crowd as they 'gather and squander,' and show them as the brothers of Jesus Christ. I cannot catch the voice of the nineteenth century, and repeat it as the latest word of God; or reveal walking in the furnace of modern competition the form of the Son of God. I believe in His presence guiding us into all truth, and I bow in reverent, if in silent awe, before the Spirit of the Age. I cannot be the prophet to exalt your desire to serve others into the service of God, or turn the doing of daily duties into spiritual life. But it has been my privilege to live with the poor whose
needs cry loudest for help, and it is out of my experience that I would speak to you of the ways of service which have seemed to me to be good.

Often lately have friends congratulated me on the interest now taken in social questions. I am glad because the interest reveals the existence of a love which is stronger than class. Love is not dead, even in breasts hardened by success and fashion—everyone that loveth has the means of knowing God. As the highest end of life is 'to know God and enjoy Him for ever,' I am glad of the interest which proves the existence of human love, which is men's guide to God.

I am, nevertheless, anxious. There is such a thing as taking the Sacrament unworthily; the Body and Blood of Christ, which feeds the life of the true man, hardens the heart of the hypocrite.

They who enter the service of the people take a solemn Sacrament, they handle the most sacred things of life, their brothers' souls. Such a Sacrament may be taken unworthily.

Society enters the service, and as it talks of its care for the poor over its wasteful dinner tables, it eats and drinks its own damnation. The many who listen eagerly to tales of suffering take the Sacrament, but instead of finding life by giving themselves as comforters, they find death by wearing out their best emotions. I fear lest this new interest end in apathy; lest they who began by caring end in callousness; or lest by some hurried action men satisfy their conscience or their pride.

To-day, then, while I pray that the Spirit of God may give to all service 'that spark from heaven for which we wait,' I will try to be practical as I speak of that kind of service with which I have come in contact.

Three methods of meeting the needs of the poor may be said to be service by giving, service by doing, and service by being.

I. As to service by giving.—A few years ago educated public opinion condemned giving. Misery and poverty were shown to be largely due to the gifts of the rich. 'The next most pernicious thing to vice,' said an able American writer
PRATTICABLE SOCIALISM

In social duties, is charity in its broad and popular sense. Against this teaching there is now a kind of reaction. Gifts of food and clothing have, we are told, their use. From some hints of authority the suggestion has come that dinners should be provided for school children and from others (who speak with authority), the demand comes that all wants should be supplied by gifts.

I think it seems to me, result from such a course. Had it to be helpful, must follow and not prevent friendship; it must strengthen and not weaken character; it must have for its object the good and not the comfort of individuals. Punishes to children would be destructive to home life, and gifts from strangers would defraud a man of the power to do his duty.

There has his good things, but Lazarus has his good things also. It is easier to take from the poor man his energy of character and his simplicity of love than it is to give him the width of view and the pleasure of living which belong to wealth.

That evils exist is not to be denied, and no sensational account quite reveals the condition in which the poor live. Dock labourers who are happy if they get twelve shillings a week all the year round, tailoresses who are paid threepence for making complete a boy's suit, these and many like them endure evils not to be described in words. Money could certainly remedy some of these evils, and yet gifts of money have ever proved harmful to the recipients.

They speak truth who loudly proclaim the sufferings of poverty, the sorrow of mothers weeping for children killed by bad air or overwork, the joylessness of life without knowledge or pleasure. They speak truth who tell the power of gifts, but they also speak truth who say that giving is cruel kindness, more likely to break up than to establish homes.

What, then, is to be done? To this I answer that gifts must continue, but their aim must be to develop character. The lowest man is brother to the highest. Gifts must aim at developing the high in the low, at bringing out the manlike qualities in those who live as animals. It is not by treating a
man as well as a pet dog that he will become manlike, it is by recognising his brotherhood with the best.

There is still a place for gifts, but they who give must have patience about the results; they must aim at the best good, the creation of character, at the development of powers of thought and feeling, at uniting man's life with God's life. They must aim at good by gifts of luxuries, of books, of the best, but they must be content not to see the good.

In giving, it is 'the passionate patience of genius' which will achieve its end. The law of giving will always seem a hard saying, and many who can say, 'I have built churches, founded hospitals, and fed the hungry,' will go away sorrowful when they hear of what sort of giving the Master and Brother of men requires. To give is not hard, but to share is hard; as Lowell said:

The holy supper is kept indeed  
In whatso we share with another's need,  
Not what we give, but what we share.

Knowledge, ideas, books, friends, joy, these are the things which make our lives; the higher pleasure which we owe to others' friendship; the higher education which so many owe to the founders of this University. These are the things which we must share with our brothers as others have shared them with us. The thing given must be the thing we ourselves most value, not its cost, but the thing itself; true giving is sharing.

If any are alarmed at the spread of giving which demoralises, there is but one means to check its extension. Unwise giving must be met by wise giving. Much more generous, much more costly to themselves must be the gifts of the wise, than the gifts of the unwise.

In the spirit of Him who said none could be His disciple, who did not give up all for the poor, let us give to develop character, to fit the lowest to enjoy the best. He who died 'worth' the most, gave His life for others.

II. As to service by doing.—There is a hymn which says, 'Doing is a deadly thing.' The saying is foolish, but it has its truth. Work with machinery wearies, we are told, the
workman by its absence of variety, by the small call it makes on his hope or fear. The man who might have found work to be rest, and following his calling to be life, finds work with a machine to be deadly. The doing which fills many lives is in the same way deadly. It follows a regular system, it has to do with a part, and not the whole, and it makes little call upon the doer's power of originating.

Modern doing, with its division of labour, and its impulse of competition, accomplishes great things, but none can say that modern doers are full of joy or life. By doing, many have got the habits and the sorrows of slaves, and they look to retire as slaves look to be free.

Doing accomplishes much, but doing is often deadly, killing in men the powers by which they could enjoy life and God.

How, then, will doing cease to be deadly? Simply when things are done with rather than for people. Governing, though it be of a kingdom, does not satisfy a man, but guiding, though it be of a child, satisfies a god. Governing is doing for others, guiding is doing with others.

The Established Church is now wanting in life, and fails in its national mission because it aims at doing good for the people, and not with or by the people.

Doing cannot be deadly when it is bound up with life, when human perversity rouses human ingenuity, when human needs rouse human hopes and fears. This, I think, is true of all doing. Bodily exercise, intellectual work, trade, are deadly doing till all are done with others, in sympathy with the many who are poor in pleasure, knowledge, or in money. It is true (I speak from experience) of that doing which is called philanthropy.

The doing for the poor, which ends in a law or institution, the doing which ends in a committee and a secretary, the doing which is done through agents, and at a distance from the poor, is deadly. All help must be co-operation, the helper and the helped must be partners, and over the thing done must be the grasped hand. Doing which helps is with the people, among friends; not for the people, among strangers.
There is a sadness unutterable which such doing could remove. Because such a little has been done with the people to carry out the laws in poor neighbourhoods, therefore it is they die of disease, bred of dirt and crowds. Because so little has been done to amuse people with people, therefore it is the lives of the majority are joyless. Because so little has been done to share the knowledge—the good and perfect gift which God has given to this age—therefore it is that in this Christian land God is unknown as the Source of life.

In our service of doing, let the rule be to serve by doing with the people.

Of such doing there may be no end, and of time to do it there is no lack. When so many have time to go round in an eddy of purposeless visits, time to labour at what profits no one, time to organise parties for those who invite again, time to make friends among the rich, there is time to do more with those whose needs call loudest.

The field of the world is white to the harvest; there is a strange drawing together of nations and classes. To do the will of God is the meat which nourishes men.

III. As to service by being.—All cannot give, all cannot do, but all can be. He who serves by being, gives the best service. It was Erskine’s life which made his chance greeting sink into the Scotch shepherd’s heart. It is the difference in what we are, which makes a difference in our work. ‘If a man be immoral,’ the other day wrote a well-known tutor, ‘its sign is on every paper he does, it destroys his work.’

Being is the measure of doing. It is they who are best who do best. The saviours of mankind have been the meek and lowly in heart, and the highest name for God is ‘I Am.’

God is not God, because He gives or because He does, but because His name, His character, His Being is love. He serves best who is most.

We live in troubled times. Our poets hear no voices such as the Psalmists heard. They do not so tell us of the God in our midst as to rouse songs of praise; they tell only of men who ‘bluster and cringe;’ of humanity ‘striving blindly and
achieving nothing'; and of those who serve as 'divided by faction, whose ranks have been broken.'

The tale is true. Why is it? It is because we have not served by being. It is through the good, men believe in goodness. Have we been righteous? It is through the hopeful that the timid gain courage. Have we been hopeful? It is through the loving that men learn to love. Have we been loving? It is through the pure—the child, the woman, the stainless man—that the world believes in purity. Have we been pure?

They who would serve have not been enough: they have rested content with success, with the amounts collected for their charity, with the institutions they have raised, with the position they have gained, with the extension of their party's influence.

They have done indeed the work, but they were not their highest, as they substituted for the pleading figure of Christ the attraction of a charity fête: or as they drew followers by some burlesque of Christianity; or as they stirred activity by appeals to party spirit, or extended Church influence by diplomacy. This want in their service has affected their work just as a base thought in the mind of an artist affects his picture.

We must be more, and to be more we must more often think of our ideal. Man is man because 'he can mind.' We must mind our ideal. The common standard of righteousness is not high enough. A truly honest man aspires to do more than satisfy the requirements of the Bankruptcy Court; we must do more than satisfy the requirements of convention and respectability. Except our righteousness exceed that of the religionists and philanthropists, we cannot be as those who serve. It is not enough that we are approved of men, that our conduct is held to be irreproachable, our lives said to be devoted, and our opinions orthodox. We must be more, and for this we must be intent on, must 'mind' the highest which we know or can conceive. As it is 'each half lives a hundred different lives.' One thing only is needful, and that is to sit at the feet of—to be intent on, as Mary was—'the Highest and Best.'
I commend, therefore, to you more frequent prayer, not prayer which just asks, but the prayer which pierces the clouds of old words, which passes the stars which lighted our fathers' ways, which will 'get to God.' God is far other than we think and greater than our creeds. God, though, is not far off. It may be that He will be found in some Nazareth of science, of thought, of life, some Nazareth ‘whence cometh no good thing.’ God is near, the knowledge of to-day is His garment, the fire of men's passion is His angel, and He rideth on the breath of their aspirations.

I commend to you the prayer which 'minds that which is Best,' and which will not let any good go without its blessing. I commend to you the heartfelt prayer which will leave you on your knees before Jesus Christ, saying, 'My Lord and my God.'

I commend to you, too, the Holy Communion, not a mystery, but the communion which is intercourse with the good and true, the communion of saints.

Men are other than they seem. The rich are not such as the poor think; the poor are not such as the rich think.

The world seems cold while in every heart a fire of love is burning, and the times wax evil while in every one is a longing to be good.

I commend to you the Holy Communion which means knowing others, which gives knowledge to get knowledge, which is intercourse of soul with soul, of deep feeling with deep feeling, and of high longing with high longing. I commend to you a communion with one another, a brotherhood of common life, which will leave you saying, 'Ever more we dwell in Christ and Christ in us.'

They who pray truly will learn of righteousness and love beyond our present imaginings. They who commune truly will learn of good in others of which they never dreamt. When we are intent on, mind, the righteousness in God and the good in man, then we shall be more, and our service of giving and doing will be the saving service of our Master.

Samuel A. Barnett.
WHYTECHAPEL

When the foreigner asks, 'Which is the worst district in London?' the answer will probably be, 'Whitechapel.' Common fame and not accurate knowledge will dictate this answer. The series of murders, and the revelations at the inquests of the daily life lived by men and women, have so impressed the public mind that Whitechapel at once suggests to strangers thoughts of degradation.

To us, old residents, the name suggests quite other thoughts. We think of the 15,000 persons living in improved dwellings, inhabiting their one, two, three, or four rooms, enjoying light, air, and water, leading simple, industrious, and upright lives. We think of the thousands of foreigners keeping up in our midst customs, some picturesque, some untidy, some shocking to the nose and taste, but themselves walking for the most part in sober and quiet ways. We think of the Fine Art Exhibition, the Students' Free Library, the Recreation Ground, the Swimming Baths, the flourishing clubs, and the many institutions, religious or secular, which show that some of the people live by something else than by bread alone. We think, lastly, of the Poor Law administration, which has drawn to Whitechapel the attention of the most thoughtful reformers. Out-relief has been abolished, and instead of 5,000 persons cringing and cursing every week around the relief office, out-relief is now given to six aged persons who survive from the old days. The abolition has not tended to any increase of in-door relief, and has called out

1 Reprinted from the *New Review.*
such voluntary service that help now reaches those in need through friendly hands.

Many of its inhabitants may be poor, many may even be of that helpless class whose wants and weaknesses break the hearts of reformers. Some of its areas, like that of Bell Lane, may contain dwellings unfit for habitation, and fit for demolition by the County Council; but to us, old residents, Whitechapel means the home of some of our best friends, the scene of many heroic acts of patience and devotion, the place where some of God's best servants live in holy communion with Him and with one another.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CRIMINAL QUARTER.

Whitechapel does not deserve its common reputation, but it has not been gained without some reason. There is lying in its very centre an old-established criminal quarter, three or four acres in extent, notorious as Flower and Dean Street, Thrawl Street, and George Street. For some unknown cause—perhaps because such characters have the habit of congregating near the City walls; perhaps because old mansions like Essex House afforded in the neighbourhood a sort of warren in which escape from justice was easy; perhaps because of neglect of duties by those who had rights—these streets, and some others which have now been cleared, have long been inhabited by thieves, loafers, and dissolute persons. The freeholder at the beginning of the century seems to have obtained from Parliament powers to deal with the property, but evidently he did not use the powers to establish a good occupation. The quarter is a sort of Alsatia. The police keep order in the main surrounding thoroughfares, and at one time urged the expediency of leaving the criminals to congregate undisturbed so that they might be at hand when wanted. This is no longer urged, but the late revelation has shown that in a district within a mile and a half of the Mansion House neither the Ten Commandments nor Acts of Parliament are recognised as law. The life so revealed is now the stock-in-trade of sensational writers, and the world grows weary of
horrors. Mr. Charles Booth, author of Life and Labour, describes the people in calm language, which is much more instructive. He says:—

'They are casual labourers of low character . . . . and those in a similar way of life who pick up a living without labour of any kind. Their life is the life of savages, with vicissitudes of extreme hardship and occasional success. Their food is of the coarsest description, and their only luxury is drink. . . . It is not easy to say how they live—the living is picked up, and what is got is frequently shared. When they cannot find threepence for a night's lodging they are turned out at night into the street. . . . From these come the battered figures who slouch through the streets, play the beggar or the bully, or help to foul the record of the unemployed—these are the worst class of corner men, who hang about the doors of public-houses, the young men who spring forward on any chance to earn a copper, the ready materials for disorder when occasion serves. . . . They render no useful service, they degrade whatever they touch. . . . While the children left in charge of this class is proportionately small, the number of young persons belonging to it is not so. Young men who take naturally to loafing, girls who take almost as naturally to the streets, some drift back from the pauper and industrial schools, others drift down from the classes of casual and regular labour.'

In this moderate language Mr. Booth describes the people who occupy the Flower and Dean Street quarter. In like manner it is possible to describe their habitations. These are 'common lodgings' and 'furnished lodgings.' The 'common lodgings' are under police supervision, and certain rules as to cleansing, the number of inmates, and the immediate removal of the sick, secure health. They accommodate men at threepence or fourpence a night, the 'doubles,' as they are called, having rooms for men and women as well as for single men. The inmates occupy a common kitchen, and in turn cook their food at the big fire. In this kitchen some bully often dominates, and the prevailing opinion is that which favours the
escape of a thief and laughs over the corruption of the young. The 'deputy' who is left in charge by the owner is simply concerned to get in the payments and to prevent such fights as might necessitate the calling in of the police. The 'furnished lodgings' are much worse in character. They are rooms in tenement houses, fitted with the most meagre of sleeping accommodation, cleansed at rare intervals, overcrowded, it may be, at once by any number of people, and occupied, it may be, during the night by many couples in succession. For each occupation eightpence or tenpence is charged.

As a means of showing by the evidence of eye-witnesses how such people live in such places, the following extracts from the reports of some of the Toynbee Hall men and others who have patrolled the streets during the last year may be useful. The extracts are taken almost wholly from the record of one month.

'September 16th.—Row between two men at 12.20 A.M. Five minutes afterwards, in same place, found man bleeding from stab in neck inflicted by a woman. Great noise from crowd. Man refused to charge woman.

'October 6th.—Disturbance in Fashion Street. Three women had been knocking about a drunken man, who had a nasty gash on the left eye and was bleeding profusely. 1.15 A.M.: A woman created a disturbance in Wentworth Street—lots of people about.

'October 9th.—Woman's head badly cut by a man. Charge brought next day by Mr. ———, but not being supported by woman was dismissed.

'October 20th.—Saw four men and as many women enter one house in Flower and Dean Street. Two couples seen to leave the same house after being there ten or fifteen minutes. In every case saw men stopped by women in the street.

'October 22nd.—Two women fighting in Thrawl Street. Man and woman fighting on second floor of house.

'October 29th.—Saw a woman dead drunk dragged along the length of Flower and Dean Street.'

The record, from which these extracts are sufficient, ex-
tends through many folios, and bears witness to the disgrace and brutality to which men and women have fallen. The incidents related are of various kinds. Of some it would be a shame to speak. Some are of rows between the drunken, some of the escape of thieves protected by the whole community and welcomed almost at every door, some of assaults on strangers, some of dissoluteness shared in by boys and girls, some of open vice. One of the last records is of a fight between women stripped to the waist, which, in the early hours of the morning, was enjoyed by many children; and on August 1, an American lady who visited the district, ‘its notorious character being known through the States,’ gave the following account of her visit:—

‘I saw two men attack a woman, one struck her and she bled profusely. Almost immediately after, the two men fought. I stepped into a coalshed, and then a policeman came and stopped the fight. I said, “Sir, you should have arrived earlier.” He answered, “Madam, these things are of daily occurrence here.”’

It is, indeed, because they are so common that they are so little known. The police can get no charges; the sufferer of to-day is the wrong-doer of to-morrow; differences seem more easily settled by fights than by the law, and all the police can do is to prevent the fights having a fatal issue.

Such is the life led in the criminal district of Whitechapel. To us who know that life, the murders seem the least of the evils brought to light. That a maniac should act as a maniac; that having no reasonable object for his act he should escape detection; that women should put themselves in such positions, and in consequence be killed—all this may be horrible, but the horror is not equal to that implied by the degradation and brutality of a whole community. The mere capture of this murderer seems to us, therefore, of less importance than the reform of the area in which the victims are prepared. The area is described by the police as ‘a plague spot.’ It infects the neighbourhood, and it tends to spread. The children seeing such sights as are common in the streets grow
familiar with vice and find interest in its excitement. Many are the boys and girls who have been drawn from the influence of home, schools, guilds, and friends by the attraction of this free bad life. The country people who take lodgings in this neighbourhood, being cheated and abused, learn in their turn to cheat and abuse. Such a 'plague spot' must be cleansed, and the area being limited to four acres, the cleansing ought not to be impossible.

REMEDIES: I.—BY CHARITABLE EFFORT

The agency which is always at hand and which can be at once applied is charitable effort, and in no place is charitable effort more active than in this neighbourhood. There is the patrol of the streets undertaken by the residents of Toynbee Hall and other inhabitants. There are 'shelters,' 'mission-stations,' 'preachings,' undertaken by the members of various sects as well as by individual missionaries.

The patrol was started with a view to create a public opinion which should assist the police in keeping order. The practice has been for two men to walk the streets between the hours of 11 p.m. and 2 a.m. They at once summon the police when a disturbance occurs; they give assistance if necessary, and offer themselves as witnesses if a charge can be got. They take note of all they see, of the use made of the houses, of the conduct of the police, of the state of the streets, and each week present to their chairman a signed record. Their presence and their constant communications with the authorities have probably had some effect in producing a better state of things. The police no longer feel themselves entirely without moral support, and the people are learning that back courts are not licensed for fights. It was small blame to the police that they let things be done in the streets which were approved in the houses, that they did not interfere to protect sufferers who the next moment might brutally inflict on them some life-long injury, and that they aimed at getting a reputation for 'tact' by letting wrong alone.
Their duty in this quarter has been hard; individual officers may have shown temper or weakness, but as a body they have done their duty well. The policeman is, after all, only the substitute for the citizen, the man who carries out in the streets the opinion of the people in the houses. If the opinion of a whole neighbourhood is in favour of vice, he is naturally less careful for right and good. The presence of the patrol officers has reminded him that there is another opinion, even in Flower and Dean Street, and as a rule he has done his best to carry out that opinion by enforcing order and preventing wrong. It is a question whether 'opinion' can be imported from other districts for so long a period as to change the character of the district. It certainly should not be necessary for hard-working men to have to patrol the streets and demand the order which ought to be demanded by the inhabitants themselves.

The charitable effort which has taken this shape may have done some good, but it hardly represents a remedy. It does not make amends for the want of that charity which leaves the vicious with no neighbours but the vicious. Christian opinion is not to be imported or exported; it must grow in the soil. The imported opinion by the patrol officers is an exotic; the opinion of the district itself must be for order before right will be done, and this is hardly possible while the houses are under the present management.

The other form taken by charitable effort is that of missions. There is probably no square mile of London in which there are so many bases of missionary enterprise. They have various names, but hardly differ in their operations. Their reports tell how refuges have been opened in the very centre of the notorious district; how to all comers is offered food and lodging at no cost, or at small cost; how, by loving words and kind acts, the hardest natures are touched.

The intention is good, but the method is not commended by experience. The offer of food and lodging appeals only to the worst side of those whose aim it is to live without working. It releases them from all necessity to make an effort, so they
loaf, they waste, they sin. Why not? They can win a lodging with a lie.

The first effect of this charity is, therefore, that large numbers of the loafing or criminal class are drawn to the district and brought within its evil influences.

The establishment, too, of a home or refuge in the very centre of a vicious quarter assumes more strength of will than can be expected of those who have done nothing more for virtue than accept a free lodging.

Under the impulse of momentary anger or momentary enthusiasm, the poor creatures enter the shelter. They are kindly received, warmed, fed, and comforted; they say they intend to lead a new life, but the next morning, waking up within sight of the old haunts, hearing, perhaps, familiar voices, their strength fails, and they go out to the old, bad life. Some may hold on long enough to be removed to a 'Home,' but the reports which tell of the hundreds rescued do not tell of the hundreds who relapse, and from the numbers given there can hardly be a vicious person who might not have had experience of a 'Home.'

Virtue, by means of free shelters, is dressed up in spurious attractions; it offers the vicious what they want on easy terms; it says, 'Give up your ways, and I will give you food and lodging.' Many accept virtue on these terms, but never having cared for her, and never having hated vice, they are not faithful. Those only can be saved who care enough to make some effort, and to promise salvation to the careless is to degrade salvation.

The second effect, therefore, of this charity is, that the way of virtue is blasphemed—something is called 'virtue' which has been won without effort, and there is no understanding of the virtue which means self-mastery, the love of others, and the joy of God. For the sake of trying to heal 'all the sick folk,' the chance of healing one is missed, and the talk of those who have been in Homes often makes the way of virtue to be despised.

Good people must do good work. Good men or good
women going in and out among these people, quietly getting hold of a boy here and a girl there, unostentatiously touching the human in some brute, are doing, and must do, good work. These rouse no greed; these provoke no blasphemy; these save the fallen by calling out the faith which makes the effort to turn from evil; these, like the Master of Man, are content if they can heal one, though many have to be left unhealed. Of these more and more are wanted; but of free shelters, free breakfasts, and endless preaching, there is more than enough.

Charitable effort, if it meant the personal service of devoted persons, might be effective to clear even such evils as abound in Flower and Dean Street. If, that is, the people who call themselves Christians were, as followers of Christ, to give up their ways and take to His ways, they might, as individuals, by love and wisdom and power, raise the fallen. For such a reign of Christ we wait; meantime we have to recognise that the charitable efforts of patrollers and of missionaries do not avail. Their goodwill and their devotion are not strong enough to oppose forces bred by long neglect and nourished by present conditions.

II.—BY THE LANDLORD

The agency which might do something against these forces, and which is also at hand, is that of the landlord. He has an immediate interest in the district; every quarter he receives the rents; he has granted the leases; he knows their covenants, and at their termination he has power to close or to renew. He, being in this immediate contact with the people, would seem to be the one whose duty it is to prevent the misuse of one house to the injury of the inhabitants of another. He, being the first to be aware of the rows, the fights, the orgies which disgrace the neighbourhood, should be the first, by means of watchmen, or by application to the police, to stop the abuse. He, having it in his power to enforce covenants, should use his power to put an end to bad occupations, and as leases fall in, it might even be expected of
him that he should board up the property rather than let a scandal continue. The loss incurred in waiting for a good tenant is a loss fairly deserved by the neglect which has let evil grow to such an extent.

All this the public has a right to expect from one who is lord of the land; if in addition he made it his care to see that the tenants shared some of his luxuries, and enjoyed a sufficiency of air and space, he would only be doing what was done by the old feudal lords by whose laws he benefits, but whose customs he does not follow.

When landlords use the language of tradesmen, talk about supply and demand, and urge that their relation with their tenants is that of simple contract, they forget that, as successors of feudal holders and of patriarchal squires, they have received rights never given to tradesmen. The landlord has exceptional powers and he might do exceptional things.

His powers indeed are so great that as long as he permits abuses he may be said to share in their profits. He, if he lets one tenant break a covenant unchecked, if he allows one house to continue in bad occupation after the lease has been surrendered, is morally as well as technically part-owner in a house of ill-fame, and the rents he takes are the price of others’ shame.

As the public conscience gets every year more Christianised, landlords will be compelled to exercise their powers; and then the force which opposes charitable effort will no longer be too great. The plague spot will be cleared, and the individuals will be saved.¹

III.—BY THE LAWS.—(a) NEW LAWS

There is, however, one other agency which might be used—the law—better laws, and better administration of existing laws.

¹ With a view to future action, it would be useful if a register of landlords could be made and published. A register of occupants is put up every year for inspection on the church doors, but no one knows of the landlords whose property breeds profit for them, while it may breed mischief for the neighbourhood.
Better laws can hardly be called an agency close at hand, so long does it take to make the rival parties which govern the country lay aside their rivalries and pass the law which removes a real abuse.

Such a law would be one enabling the local authority to deal with an area morally insanitary as it does with one physically insanitary, and perhaps more of the cost might be thrown on those participating in the profits. By means of such a law the area in question would long ago have been cleared, and the management put in the hands of those with the power and the will to see right done. Under Lord Cross's Acts unhealthy areas in the neighbourhood have been cleared, and the change wrought by landlords of good will is very marked.

Another law which is wanted is one to control the so-called 'furnished lodgings.' They are not technically houses of ill-fame, and so they escape condemnation under the Acts levelled against these houses. They are not in the occupation of a person or persons who use them for immoral purposes; they are used by mere passengers, and an extension of the law is needed to check a use so low that it seems never to have been contemplated as possible by previous legislators.

Further, the law which governs the management of common lodgings might be improved. Lodgings should be licensed only in houses of a fairly high rating—'doubles' and 'singles' should not be allowed under the same roof; the houses should be on main thoroughfares, and the provision of more than one common room and of sufficient offices should be enforced.

(b) BY ADMINISTRATION OF EXISTING LAW

The better administration of existing law is the chronic want of London. The streets in East London are ill-lighted and ill-cleansed. Drunkenness goes on in the public-houses, dirt and noise make life hard and joyless. Existing laws provide, when they were enforced by the Vestries, that there shall be no dark corners tempting to vice by offering security from recognition; no filth in the streets to make housewives hopeless; no persons drunk because they have been served
when beyond their own control; no streets given up to noise and rioting.

There may be some reason in the present system of local government which throws the expense of lighting and cleaning on a body of poor ratepayers, why poor districts should be dirty and dark; but the real reason of the neglect to administer law is distaste for the duty. Men who make great efforts to get a new law passed shrink from the daily drudgery, the search into details, the unpleasant conflicts involved in putting laws into action. The better administration of the law depends on the growth of public spirit and of the will to do things which do not win renown.

The ideal Christian, to whom a small wrong and a great wrong are equally offences against God, who seeks no praise from men and is no respecter of persons, is also the ideal administrator.

Such men on the Local Boards would not be content that people should be satisfied with dirt; they would not consult their own ease or dignity; and they would sometimes make things uncomfortable for their constituents.

The question remains whether this is possible when a community is composed of only one class; whether, indeed, local government is possible in London till in each area of government there are sufficient of each class to support the governors in setting their faces against wrong doers in any one class.

**EFFECT ON THE CRIMINAL POPULATION**

If, by some means, by the action of landlord or law, the district were cleared, the Christian conscience of the public would still ask, 'What will happen to the people?' 'When they are scattered, will they become any better?' 'May not seeds of vice take root elsewhere?' To which it may be answered—As long as a community of vice exists the habits of generations are felt to be against order, and public opinion makes the first step to virtue impossible. As soon as the community is broken up some of the individuals, released from its pressure, would turn to good; others missing its support
would be less evil and happily the breaking-up of such a community as that which exists in Whitechapel must mean the scattering of the individuals. There is no district to which no white body could swarm, and in most districts the individuals would find an atmosphere prejudicial to vicious habits.

There is another advantage which would come to the people themselves if the law were rigorously applied. They are often what they are by indolence; they are in one sense the pets of some, people who easily win gifts, men and women who have been too of their sexes. Their want is stern, rigorous treatment, and the experience of being "moved on" will be in some way remedial.

Sacrifice and kindness are fellow workers not enough other seen together. They who would help their neighbours must be seen absolutely resolute to give nothing except in response to effort, strict to bring home to each the result of his mistakes, deaf to all excuses why the thing which ought to have been done was left undone. They must be stern and they must be kind with the kindness born of the belief that beneath the indolence, the vice, the indolence, is the spark of good which love may by patience cherish into a flame.

In a word, it is only the service of those in whom is the spirit of Christ which can effect any good. The object of breaking up this criminal quarter is that the individual criminals may be brought within touch of the Christian influences of the day.

THE NEEDS OF WHITECHAPEL

Whitechapel, however, let it be once more repeated, is not criminal. Its needs—if once the four acres were cleared—are not to be met by police and missions. Whitechapel has other needs which are real and pressing.

There are two sites besides the criminal quarter condemned as unhealthy, and closely inhabited by poor and industrious people. They need to be cleared.

There are ignorant men and women who, labouring all day without holidays or leisure, have forgotten all their book-
learning: they need educated friends who will teach them to organise themselves so as to raise their wages, to amuse themselves by rational pleasures, and to take interest in the things which belong to humanity.

There are foreigners—strange and timid—they need someone to teach them English, to lead them to adopt the English standard of cleanliness, and to give them the welcome due to strangers.

There are intelligent workmen and clerks eager to know more about the world in which they live: they need teachers who on Sundays, in class-rooms or in the fields, will teach them with simplicity and sympathy.

There are boys and children, swarming in the streets, disturbing others and wearying themselves with noise: they need those who will take them into the country, found for them guilds and clubs, play with them in the open spaces, and guide them as they pass from youth to manhood.

There are the poor, broken by loss or sickness, injured by careless charity: they need the patient visitor who will generously and thoughtfully give, considering them not only as people to be fed, but as men and women aspiring to be free and independent.

There are the selfish, the coarse, the hopeless: they need that knowledge of God which transfigures life and which can be given, not by tracts, but by those who themselves have learnt the truth through study, through feeling, through pain and through prayer.

Whitechapel, like other East End districts, has not in itself inhabitants for the service of all its needs. It has, however, by the service its people render to the common wealth of London, a claim on the leisure of other people; the claim has already to some extent been recognised, and some of its needs are met by those who have themselves settled in our midst. But the demand is far beyond the supply, and we who know Whitechapel well still hope for others who will work and live in our district.

Samuel A. Barnett.
TRAINING FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

Three years ago London was startled by the evidence of its great 'fluid population.' The unemployed, by crowds and riots, forced themselves into notice, and ever since there have been inquiries, investigations, and Commissions. Of these inquiries Mr. Booth's has been most to the purpose, and he, having analysed the occupations of the inhabitants of East London, estimates that out of a total of 908,000, about 314,000—men, women, and children—are dependent on casual labour. For the workers of this number work is so irregular that a great part could easily be performed by those in the class of regular workers, and the majority of them may fairly, if not technically, be numbered among the unemployed. What is true of East London is probably true of South London, and will soon be true of North London, where, forgotten by their fellow citizens, the poor are again congregating by themselves.

This great 'fluid population' makes a greater claim on statesmanship than does even that of Irish discontent. For three years its presence has been evident, and the only statesmanship shown is that which puts off trouble by appointing Commissions of Inquiry.

Inquiry can add little to what is known. Masses of the unemployed, who are ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-taught, frequently congregate; they may be seen at meetings, they gather at

---

1 Reprinted from the Nineteenth Century of November 1888.
street-corners, and seem almost to rise from the earth if a street accident happens. Their faces tell the tale of their poverty, and if some of their faces tell also of ill-will and idle habits, the necessity that something should be done is not less, but greater. The existence of such a class numbering in London its tens of thousands is a national disgrace and a national danger.

It is a disgrace to statesmanship that the earnings of workers should be consumed in the support of unwilling idlers, and this happens as long as the unemployed are kept alive, for it must be remembered that the bread which they eat, insufficient though it be for themselves, is taken out of the mouths of others. All who are idle hang like a dead weight round the necks of the busy, and the workers have a right to complain of a system which makes them poor to keep others poorer. It is a shocking thing to say of men created in God's image, but it is true, that the extinction of the unemployed would add to the wealth of the country.

The disgrace to common humanity is even greater, that in an age enriched by new possessions, material and spiritual, there should be so many thousands 'untaught, comforted, and unfed.' There is now no want of knowledge about the facts, as society during many seasons has amused itself with tales of 'how the poor live.' Everyone who spends his pound, or his thousand pounds, on luxury, knows how he might spend that money on institutes or open spaces, or books, for others' service; and every worshipper who is comforted by good news of God knows that among the poor many perish for lack of that knowledge. The title 'unemployed' covers no longer an unknown quantity. The look of the men, their weak frames, their anxious eyes, their dull faces are familiar. Their homes—the single room: bedroom, kitchen, washhouse, and nursery, with its bit of paper decoration as its owners' claim of kinship with their fellows—have been visited. Their children, those who survive the hardships of infancy, are seen in the schools and pitied because they are ill-fed and ill-clad.
The dull, hopeless, shiftless, and sad life of the poor is known.

Whose is the fault that men and women are untaught and uncomfor ted? It is the fault of every selfish person, and the disgrace is to our common humanity.

But the existence of the unemployed is something more than even a disgrace; it is a danger to the well-being of society, leading the kind-hearted and the vain to all sorts of extravagance, and justifying the selfish in all sorts of hard-ness. Because of their presence, schemes of mandlin philanthropy or of ambitious vanity get a hearing. The kind-hearted, pointing to their needs, demand gifts of free-dinners and unrestricted out-relief. Talkers, moved by frantic vanity or unlimited suspicion, have it in their power to say: 'In this misery you see what comes of free trade, of monarchy, of property,' or of whatever other cause they themselves are for the moment attacking. Because, too, the unemployed live a low life, the selfish are encouraged to go on saying, 'Nothing can be done,' till their hearts are hardened. A degraded class creates an oppressive class, and the end is a revolution which means 'the death of the first-born.'

Far be it from me to say that this condition of things has been reached in London; but when one part of society is content with a low life and another part of society is indifferent to that content, class warfare is not far distant. There are tens of thousands, with the thoughts and feelings of men, living the life of beasts, greedy for what they can get, careless of the means of getting, rejoicing in low pleasures, and moved by a blind sense of injustice ready to take shape in foolish demands and wild acts; there are, on the other side, thousands with the knowledge that such lives are lived by their neighbours, who go on making themselves comfortable and happy, and their hardness of heart takes shape in Commissions, in lucid expositions over dinner tables that 'the statistics of pauperism show no increase,' and in admirable reasons, founded on political economy, that 'nothing can be done.'

This state of things is dangerous. The unemployed may
be driven by the police out of the thoroughfares, they may have no place in Poor Law returns, but their existence cannot be denied, and if their ignorance and their sense of injustice are allowed to increase, they may some day appear, to over-turn not only the ‘admirable administration of the Poor Law,’ but also the very foundations of our trade and greatness. They—manifest, that is, in their misery and bitterness—may at some moment be the extra weight to turn the scale against free trade, in-door relief, or religion. The existence of the unemployed is a fact, and this fact constitutes a danger to the wealth and well-being of the community.

Alongside is another set of facts equally striking. Farms near London are going out of cultivation, and agricultural labourers are coming into the towns because there is no demand for their labour in the country. A farm, which is actually crossed by a railway, was recently offered at 5l. an acre, and other farms in Essex can be had for 10l. an acre. Certain economists view this state of things with equanimity; they say that the same causes which operate in other trades operate also in the farming trade, that land is going out of cultivation because cultivation does not pay, and that labour is wisely transferred to other occupations. But the question arises: ‘Are we to accept the idleness of the land as we accept the idleness of the Spitalfield’s loom? or are we to explain it as we explain the fact that there are many starving sempstresses while cloth waits to be made up for want of good sempstresses? In a word, is the idleness of the land to be taken as the result of progressive industry, or is it due to want of skill?’

The first answer will commend itself to those who believe that self-interest, left to its own devices, must discover the right road, and that the self-interest of farmers who have given up their farms and of labourers who have left their work must, after some pain during the period of transition, lead to a healthier state of things.

The second answer will commend itself to common minds, who know that vegetables, fruit, and poultry are brought into England, to the value of some millions of money yearly, which
'preserving their game,' and the modern answer differs only in not suggesting so active an occupation.

'But,' it is said, 'the unemployed are not fit to work on the land; they could not be induced to emigrate.' These people have not, that is, the spirit of adventure which is born of hope, nor the skill which comes by training.

It ought not to be impossible to give the training and inspire the hope. 'Why, the four-footed worker has already got all that this two-handed one is clamouring for!' There is not a horse in England, able and willing to work, but has due food and lodging, and goes about sleek-coated, satisfied in heart. And you say it is impossible. The human brain, looking at those sleek horses, refuses to believe in such impossibility for English men.' It ought not to be impossible to use these men, who are of more value than many horses. The ignorance which makes them unfit for work—not worth 4d. an hour to an employer—and undesirable as colonists, could be removed by training; their timidity and indolence which makes them refuse to try new fields, could be removed by hope. It ought not to be impossible for politicians and lawyers and clergy and guardians to evolve a plan for giving these unemployed training and hope.

A word here is due to the character of the men whose labour has no value. They are not all loafers and idlers, nor all bitter and antagonistic to society: a large proportion of them are steady, honest men, with the will to work. A witness not inclined to be partial tells how eagerly many rush to any jobs, and the same witness credits them with a sharpness and a versatility which enables them to easily pick up theknacks of new occupations. It is the experience of their neighbours that men, whose physique has been lowered by want of food, and whose education has been such as to leave them ignorant, do work, when work is possible, with an energy, and do resist temptation with a will, hardly to be understood by their comfortable critics. The homes of the so-called unemployed, though they be only single rooms, and though the labour of the inmates be without economical value, are often schools in
which are taught lessons of the patience with which hardships may be borne and of the love which is stronger than poverty. The faults of many of the unemployed are due to ignorance and despair, and might be remedied.

The obvious course to pursue is to put them on the unworked lands, and give them the promise of the ultimate possession of a portion in England or the colonies. They would thus gain the skill to reap and to dig, and there is no hope so powerful as that of 'possessing a bit of land.'

An agricultural training-farm—a technical school in land work—a workfield as a supplement to the workhouse, is a suggestion which must occur to many minds.

It may be assumed that sufficient land could be bought for such a purpose within a hundred miles of London. The persons selected for employment would be able-bodied men, such as seem likely to be both able and willing to profit by the training to be given on the farm. They would be then called on to do the work of the place, to clean the land, to dig, to look after the cattle, and to do rough carpentry. They would be instructed when they needed instruction, and would be taught some of the elementary rules which govern the growth of crops or the care of animals. They would be called on to submit to all the regulations of the superintendent; but it would be understood that the regulations should not be merely vexatious, but framed for the better education of each labourer. They would receive board and lodging and be credited with a small wage payable at the expiration of the term on the farm. Lastly, admission would only be offered to men of whose wives and families support was by some means, charitable or other, assured in town. The length of stay would be at the discretion of the superintendent, three months, six months, or a year; but to those who proved themselves efficient the offer would be made of a fixed tenure of land in England or of emigration to the colonies.

Such is the bare outline of a scheme obviously open to many developments; but for it the claim is set up that it is practicable and meets the necessities of the case.
It is practicable because it is an extension of a system of industrial training now given in schools and workhouses. If boys and men are trained by school managers and Guardians to make mats and brushes, they may equally well be trained in agricultural labour. The scheme moreover meets the necessities of the case more adequately than a training which sends out mat and brush makers to compete in a crowded market. It aims to give skill to develop an almost dead industry, to put power into hands which would increase wealth by increasing the produce of the earth, to bring out affection for the land which God has given them, in men grown careless of anything higher than a livelihood. Further it aims to offer the hope which alone makes work effective, which brings out interest, intelligence, energy, and persistence. 'By hope we are saved' is as true in the economic as in the spiritual world.

If the scheme is said to be one involving great expense, it is to be remembered that no expense can be greater than that now incurred. The unemployed are now kept, their earnings are taken out of the food-cupboard of those almost as poor as themselves, their support is a national cost, a charge which the people pay as truly as that of the army and navy. The mischief is that the support of the unemployed has now no result but to increase the number of the ill-fed and ill-living. If their support on a training-farm turned only one in ten into a wealth-producing member of the community, the gain would be great.

There must, it is thus clear, be some means better than that in use for keeping the unemployed. The extension of out-relief has been fully condemned by experience; the artificial limitation of population is equally condemned by the moral sense of the community; some form of education, technical or other, has been recognised as the only effective means of relief, and a training-farm is a form of education.

The open question remains: 'Shall this farm be directed by legal or by voluntary agency?' It may be granted that the help of both Guardians and of the charitable will be needed, but the
practicable socialism

QUESTIONS.-"Must the farm be initiated and managed by the Poor Law or by some voluntary association?"

At present there is a consensus of educated opinion against a means of education, and that the use of out-relief for a temporary need is demoralising. "Out-relief," Mr. Paley argues, "is one of those tender mercies which in its effect on the poor themselves is cruel in the extreme." An excessive form of help is too great a temptation for ordinary human nature, and rapidly develops pauperism," is the text of some of the most able pamphlets.

Reformers who have done a good work for the poor are naturally afraid lest the evil they have driven away in the shape of out-door relief may return in some new form of in-door relief. They argue now that the offer of work on a farm will make pauperism attractive, that labourers will thus be tempted to degrade themselves, and that idleness and low wages will ensue. They say the scheme is wrong in principle because it offers to the poor "an eligible" maintenance. That is to say, they rely on the disagreeableness of in-door treatment to sting men into activity. A prison-like garb, a prison-like task of stone-breaking, a prison-like system of control, a vexatious set of rules against talking, a stigma attached to the term 'pauper,' the solitary confinement of the casual ward—these constitute the deterrent force against too ready a reliance on State help, and the mitigation of this force by the establishment of a farm is deprecated.

The offence of the proposed scheme is that its offer is 'eligible.' The arguments of its opponents are based, it will be seen, on the assumption that ineligibility or disagreeableness must be the condition of every offer of relief, so that applicants may be 'deterred.'

Is mere disagreeableness a deterrent worthy a civilised community? In a barbaric state it may deter wrong-doers to take an eye for an eye; in a civilised state such a punishment is considered brutal, and the wrong-doer is treated as one to
be educated. In our prisons the schoolmaster and the trades-
master take the place of the executioner, and instead of a
brand the criminal, at the end of his term, receives wages he
has earned.

It would seem, therefore, that the disagreeableness and the
vexations with which poverty is punished belong to the bar-
baric stage. Men and women who have become poor have as
much right to be educated as the criminals; they cannot be
driven to work by brands and bullying any more than the
criminal can be driven to righteousness by giving an eye for an
eye. May it not therefore be assumed that in these days a
form of deterrent must also be a form of education. A mere
deterrent—the treatment which is hateful to the loafer, but
which is also repulsive to the honest poor—represents a worn-
out system.

These brands of pauperism, this stone-breaking, this soli-
tary confinement of the casual can only rouse effort by rousing
resentment. By submission to God's punishments a man
finds his way back to life; by obedience to these invented
vexations a man becomes an enemy to society.

A system of mere deterrents cannot long survive; one
must be devised which, if it punishes, does not degrade; State
relief must not indeed be attractive, but neither must it be so
repulsive as to offer to the honest and ignorant man no means
of fitting himself for work, even if he submit to control.

It is not fair to deprive a man of heaven, but it is fair to
say 'he must work out his own salvation.' A deterrent must
be a form of education, a law which if a man obeys, he will
be improved thereby.

The relief offered on the training-farm will, for example,
be in the truest sense deterrent. What loafer would endure
to be sent out of London to occupy a hut apart from his
family and his friends, to do dull work in the fields, to submit
to continual training of mind and body, to be deprived even of
the excitement of gas-light. The loafer hates, above all things,
to be improved, and the farm would be more distasteful to him
than the workhouse, where he has at any rate the fun of
foiling the master's efforts to make him take his discharge. On the other hand, what honest man would not gladly endure loneliness, ill-health or labour if at the end he could see himself able to earn a living and serve his children. Any man who, being out of work, refused such an offer would get no sympathy or encouragement from his neighbours of any class.

An indirect advantage of a training-farm would indeed be the right direction of a sympathy which is now often given to those who say they would starve rather than go to 'the house.' Such sympathy from members of the steady classes makes many agitations dangerous, and may, if it be not guided, help in the overthrow of beneficial action. The knowledge that in the workhouse education, and not punishment, was offered would be a guide to sympathy, and at last gain for Guardians the approval of working people.

Another line of argument followed by those who object to the management of the training-farm being under the Poor Law takes its start from their conception of what is meant by pauperism. 'If,' they say, 'a man receives relief from the rates he is a pauper, and as a pauper will be shunned by his fellows and refused in the colonies.' Now by the term 'pauper' is meant the cringing creature who schemes to escape work; and the question arises whether it is relief, or the method of its administration, which brings a man down to this condition. Children get their education for nothing or for a nominal fee, working men enter the Poor Law infirmary or a hospital during illness, State pensioners take their pensions, sons enjoy what their fathers earned—all these have relief and are not made thereby cringing creatures. On the other hand, the recipients of out-relief, the cadgers who beg for coal-tickets, the habitués of the workhouse, are degraded. All receive relief, but only the latter may truly be described as 'paupers.'

Pauperism represents a moral condition which results not from the acceptance of relief, but, like other conditions, is more or less traceable to fifty different causes.

The relief offered in the training-farm would aim at exert-
ing an influence which would counteract pauperism; it would not, like out-relief, depending on the chance favour of an official or on the cleverness of an applicant’s tale, tempt some to bully and some to cringe, but, offered according to rules capable of being universally understood, would promote steady action; neither would it, like much in-door relief, be given as if it were wrung out of the ratepayers, affording the recipients the demoralising pleasure of being gainers by others’ loss, but it would be given with the distinct object of training men to work. No citizen would therefore grudge the expense any more than he grudges the labour spent on education, and no recipient would be any more degraded than is a man who gets his technical teaching at the People’s Palace.

As a final argument it is said that if Guardians employ men on a training-farm, the belief will be encouraged that it is the duty of the State to find work for the unemployed. In answer to which it must be repeated that the object of the farm is not to give work but to give training. The Guardians do already teach such trades as carpentering, baking, and mat-making: there can hardly be such a distinction between working on the produce of the land and on the land itself as to condemn the latter as dangerous. The Standard, commenting on the proposal, says, ‘An experiment for so well-defined a purpose, and conducted strictly on the principle of making all paupers work hard for their living, would be little likely to be confounded with such pernicious establishments as the national workshops of political dreamers.’

With every sympathy, therefore, for the objects of those who dread lest Poor Law relief should affect the independence of the people, I submit that the establishment of a training-farm is not open to the objection that it is false to the principle of Poor Law reform.

Whether the direction of such a farm shall be in official or voluntary hands must be settled simply on practical grounds. For either there is much that may be urged. The Guardians have an established position, the command of money, and they do all their work under the public eye. A voluntary
association has a certain freedom of action, allows for the play of enthusiasm, and depends for success on public support. The elements which each supply are necessary. In the working of the farm there must be stability and effective control; there must also be individual care and a certain elasticity in management.

Ought the direction to be in the hands of a Board of Guardians, which gives stability; or in the hands of an association, which gives elasticity? Clearly stability should come before elasticity. A firm government must be established before changes can be successfully tried, and there is little doubt that Guardians would be recognised as the right body to direct a training-farm were it not (1) that the scheme is suspected as a new departure, and (2) that public bodies are in bad repute.

If the scheme were an experiment in a totally different direction to any undertaken by Guardians, there might be good reason for entrusting it to a body which would commit the State to nothing, and which would die without leaving heirs. As, however, a training-farm is a legitimate development of the industrial training of a model workhouse and of the remedial efforts of an infirmary to help the same class of persons, and as fitfulness of management would be fatal, there is the best reason for entrusting the direction to Guardians.

But public bodies are in bad repute. The malpractices which have been lately disclosed, the common talk about the red tape of officialism, the published reports of the vain discussions on Boards—all these things make official management unpopular. Voluntary associations meet in private, but if their reports were published, favouritism would be discovered, delays made manifest, and wasted time shown to be the not unfrequent result of a meeting. In addition, their action is spasmodic, depending on windfalls, or fitful, depending on the will of some powerful supporter. They as frequently die as live, and the amount of money and energy which is every year sunk by the weak administration, the badly chosen officials,
and the follies of voluntary associations would appal even those hardened by tales of expenditure in public offices.

It is hard to judge between the effectiveness of official and voluntary bodies. It is everyone's business to abuse a Board; it is no one's business to abuse a charity, and it is the business of every supporter to sing its praises. So the common opinion gets a bias against Boards.

If I sum up a somewhat long experience, I would say that the fitfulness and uncertainty of voluntary agencies make them more unfit for directing work than does the somewhat wooden stability of public Boards. I recall with pain the method covering a want of method, the affectation of business forms while money was being stolen, and the rapid succession of revolutionary policies which have marked some well-designed societies. At the same time I recall with pleasure the order, the care, and the continuity which have counterbalanced the slowness and density of many public Boards.

On the whole the best results seem to me to be attained when volunteers supplement official action. The Guardians, for instance, teach the children in their schools, but lady visitors befriending those children incline the teaching to the needs of life. The relieving officers discover the cases of poverty, but the visitors of the Charity Organisation Society making friends with the poor discover the means of relief. The School Board works the schools, but the local managers make the work effective for higher education.

In the present case, therefore, I am disposed to say that the most practical course would be for the Guardians to buy the land, admit the labourers, and administer the farm. By this means the experiment could be made with an adequate support of money, and with a fair promise of permanence, and under the supervision of the myriad-eyed public. If it were left to voluntary action, there would be the delay consequent on the difficulty of raising money, and then the greater difficulty of getting consistent and persistent management. Because of want of money, or because of excess of zeal, the plan would break down and be discredited without a fair trial.
A training-farm dependent for its support on the moods of the benevolent or on the power of its secretary to write sensational appeals, dependent for its control on the wayward wills of a committee subject now to one leader and now to another, would have no stability, and a subsidy voted by the Guardians would not add this essential quality.

A training-farm under the Guardians might partake of the nature of a workhouse: the administration might be rigid, the application of ideas to forms might be slow, the representation of officials might get undue consideration, but the management would be stable, and the service of volunteers would do much to add the individual care and the development which depends on enthusiasm.

The only practical and practicable course, it seems to me, is for Guardians to take the direction of the scheme.

If a further argument be needed, it may be found, I think, in the position which Guardians occupy in the public mind. They are elected by the ratepayers as the Guardians of the poor. They will not be held to have fulfilled their duties if they do nothing but sting the poor to action by refusing out-relief and by making in-door relief distasteful. Tonics are not a universal remedy, and some characters are too weak to endure the tonic of strict treatment. Guardians will be held responsible if, as may well happen during some winter, a chance brings to their gates a starving multitude. They will be asked, why they did not foretell the catastrophe and why they did nothing to prevent it. To be a Guardian, and not to guard, is to hold an office without doing its work.

Statesmanship consists in prevention more than in cure. It is for the Guardians of London to seek, if even they are unable to carry out, the means of settling the problem of the unemployed, of hushing that cry which is so much more bitter because it rises from men who, without knowledge, are in poverty, in misery, and in sin. It is for want of character that so many suffer, and those means alone are worth support which are fellow-workers with God to develop character.

Samuel A. Barnett.
THE WORK OF INDIGNATION

Professor Seeley thirty years ago published 'Ecce Homo.' The book caused a great movement of thought, and one of its most remarkable chapters is on what is called 'The Law of Resentment.'

Mercy is there defined as 'pity plus indignation.' The man who cannot be angry is declared to be the man who cannot be merciful, and it is shown by many an example with what strength, energy, and sustained force our Lord, the Christ, could be angry.

St. Paul, who took up his Master's teaching, was fierce against every form of evil. He knew the meaning of love as few have ever known it, but indignation at sin, anger at weakness, burns through all his words. He felt that character and not circumstance makes misery. The kingdom of hell, as the kingdom of heaven, is within. St. Paul could punish where he loved; and our mental picture of him is of a man strong as well as tender, able to burn as well as to warm.

It is not without reason that among the followers of Christ are found fierce inquisitors and also gentle and sweet ministers to the body's needs. The assumption of the inquisitors that agonies of pain are less evils than the soul spotted with sin is Christian; the belief of the brother of pity that it is man's duty to tend and to serve is also Christian. Our Lord did preach anger as well as gentleness; He left a sword for men's hands as well as a cross for their shoulders, and gave them a commission to condemn as well as to forgive. He justified war against the enemy of manhood, and the reform He

1 A sermon preached in Bristol Cathedral, December 24, 1893.
initiated was one which, 'striking at the bondage of the body
gave the franchise to the soul.' He aimed to make character,
not to change circumstance, and his watchword was to the
individual. 'Thou must be born again.'

The efficient reforming spirit, the religion which has
changed the world, has aimed to cure men's vices rather
than their sufferings, has i.e. been a refiner's fire, purging the
to the heart, forcing the individual to turn from
complaint or abuse to say 'I—I only have sinned.' Puritanism
was a reforming force which changed the face of England—
setting up and pulling down—and its strength was in its
appeal to the individual conscience. It commenced within
the man who himself gazed face on God, and felt in his
own soul the scorching fire of His intolerable holiness.

And if we turn to our own experience, they, I take it, who
have really helped us in our hour of need have not been
the pitiful and the kind, those ready with the excuses, 'You
could not help it,' 'Others are to blame,' but the strong and
the pure, who, holding our hands in love, have by their indignation
at our sin shown their sympathy with our real selves,
and given us strength for the new birth.

Pity by itself degrades and weakens a man. Pity which
is also angry and indignant implies respect—recalls the
sufferer to thoughts of his manhood and gives him strength.
Love came as a refiner's fire, and Christ is Saviour because
he is angry as well as pitiful.

The test of a true reforming spirit is that it must be
capable of anger as well as of pity. A reforming spirit is
now brooding over the face of society, and its working is
very evident to all who have lived twenty-one years in
Whitechapel. Under its impulse knowledge and health,
schools and better houses, are within reach of the poor.
People are turning away from brutal pleasures to seek after
knowledge. The workman denies himself that he may raise
the wages of his less skilled fellows; the capitalist by laws
and by gifts concerns himself to make the ways of labour
more happy.
It is tempting to me who see the changes which have been made in Whitechapel—the wide streets, the goodly houses, the public baths, the library, the recreation ground—and am anxious for like changes elsewhere, to cry ‘Peace, peace.’ It is tempting to me to call on all and say, ‘Go and help,’ ‘Go and give,’ ‘Do what others have done.’

But I am not here as a social reformer. I am here as a messenger of Christ, Whose coming the prophet foresaw to be as a refiner’s fire purging and purifying His people.

As such, when I consider the ways of this modern reformation they seem to me to be wanting in that indignation and in that power of anger which has always been the mark of the true reforming spirit. It is not like a refiner’s fire.

There is, e.g., abundant pity for the weak, the drunkard, and the fallen. There are outbursts of fury because stumbling blocks are left in the paths, but there is little anger either at the carelessness which leaves them or at that which stumbles over them. No one falls—as you and I know—without some fault of his own. The drunkard may inherit tendencies, may have been neglected as a child, may be weakened by bad food and close air, but he himself knows that he has done what he need not have done. The rich man may be hardened by his wealth, blinded to his neighbours’ needs, and wronged by unjust abuse, but he knows of things undone which he might have done. Excuses are, it seems to me, much too commonly made for suffering and unhappiness, selfishness and mistakes. Gifts and promises, change of surroundings, are offered as a cure for all ills. In the desire to be just in trifling matters men become unjust in the greatest matters. They make an effort to be liberal, and they sometimes lose sight of principle. They seek to do honour to all parties, and they often put sentiment in the place of truth. There is abundant pity for suffering; there is also abundant abuse for those who seem to cause the suffering. But neither pity nor abuse are sustained or dignified by the quality of anger.

Browning in his ‘Tale of a Physician’ suggests the secret
of true anger. He speaks of Lazarus who had died and been called to life. The man, he says, to whom 'on earth heaven had been opened' ever after saw things in other proportion. 'Discourse of prodigious armaments or of the passing of a mule, 'tis one. Speak of some trifling fact, he will gaze as if he caught prodigious import. Should his child sicken unto death, why look for scarce abatement of his cheerfulness, while a word, gesture, glance from that same child will startle him to an agony of fear—exasperation just as like.'

The man i.e. who had seen God saw things in other proportion than popular reformers see them. His anger was not roused by the prodigious armaments of capital or of labour: it was not moved by the child's death but by some trifling fact, by the silent growth of suspicion, by the greedy, the impure glance.

It is for want of seeing God as Lazarus saw Him that modern Christianity is so often emasculate and sentimental, and that modern reform lacks the necessary anger.

Amid the satisfaction roused by fuller churches, by better clad and by better ordered people, there remains the fear lest there is no greater love of truth, no truer sense of justice, no more reverence—lest the humble and meek who are being exalted may not prove even more selfish and more tyrannical than the high and mighty who are being cast down.

God forbid that the reforming energy should be checked. The contrast between East London and West London, between the circumstances of the poor and of the rich, is disgraceful to our humanity. The contrast between the places in which the rich worship, and the places, mean, dirty, and ill-ordered, in which the poor worship. The contrast between well-swept streets with their fine buildings and the signs of varied life and narrow dreary passages lined by mean houses and used by a monotonous crowd. The contrast between the resources of leisure possible for the inhabitants of one half of London and those possible for the other half. God forbid that the reforming energy which destroys this contrast should be checked.
God forbid, too, that there should be less tenderness in dealing with the suffering and the fallen. What, after all, is the tenderness of this age compared with the tenderness of Christ, who would not wound even a child's feeling, and who cherished the Magdalen? What is our pity compared with His?

The Christian's tenderness must exceed that of the humanitarian, but it must be a tenderness which, like that of Christ, can condemn sin. It must even as it bends over the sufferer, even while it comforts, dare to punish and rebuke. Its love must have eyes to see sin as the worst evil, and seeing, to burn. It must say to each, 'Thou must be born again.'

Popular reform has not, it seems to me, this quality of anger, and one sign of its absence is a decreased consciousness of sin. We do not feel the sins we own.

We so easily forgive others that we forgive ourselves, we are so familiar with excuses that we excuse ourselves. All the while we live part of our lives in what we know to be a lie; we say to ourselves, 'It was circumstance, the man, the woman tempted me'; but in our heart of hearts we know the excuse is not valid. A deeper voice which says 'My fault' will not be silenced. Tennyson puts terrible words in the mouth of the wronged woman: 'I forgive you; if you ever forgive yourself you are even lower and baser than even I can well believe you.' Words like these pierce through the easy philosophy and the easier Christianity of our day. We dare not forgive ourselves.

It is this attitude which, resisting the soft relaxing air of modern thought, I would fix on you and on myself. I preach that Christ comes as a refiner's fire. We must not forgive ourselves, admitting excuses and passing on blame. We must be stern with our sins. Would we keep in this attitude we must live as Browning's Lazarus, in that atmosphere where things are seen in their real proportion.

In the presence of God and in the vastness of eternity, lies and self-indulgence, greed and vanity, impurity and suspicion, loom out as the great things. These are they which
crucify the good, and drive joy out of the world; these are they which abide when poverty, disease, and death have passed.

When we get away from the rival promises of parties, away from pictures of misery and poverty drawn by reformers in a hurry, away from the appeals to pity. When we stand by the Cross and gaze into eternity, the excuses we make for ourselves and others will sound empty and false. We, feeling the flames of the cleansing fire, will be stern with sin wherever it be—in ourselves or in others. We shall each humbly and with real meaning say, 'God be merciful to me a sinner'; and we shall be better reformers of the wrongs of our time.

Samuel A. Barnett.